

THE
AMERICAN QUARTERLY
CHURCH REVIEW,
AND
ECCLESIASTICAL REGISTER.

VOL. XXI. — APRIL, 1869. — No. 1.

ART. 1. — SIR THOMAS MORE. PART I.

Roper's and Cresacre More's Lives.

More's English Works. 1557.

More's Latin Works.

Erasmi Epistolæ.

Wordsworth's Ecclesiastical Biography.

State Papers of the Reign of Henry VIII.

Froude, Anderson, Jortin, Strype, Sir Jas. Mackintosh, Campbell, Collyer, Burnet.

It is a truth full of comfort in dark days, that Christ hath never left his Church. The Word, the Holy Spirit, the Sacraments, and ordinances, each in that way which Christ hath appointed, have never ceased their work of regenerating and sanctifying the fallen sons of Adam. And holy men, new-born in Christ and using diligently the grace given to them, have ever been "perfecting holiness in the fear of the Lord," even when, to the worldly eye, the Church of Christ presented a scene of confusion and strife, false teaching, and unholy living. Such a man at such a time was Sir Thomas More.

Some things there are, indeed, concerning which we may now begin to judge impartially, which have cast a stain upon a name

otherwise so spotless, and so exalted. It is not the writer's wish to disguise these. But, in sketching a life so attractive, a character so winning, he thinks that an unprejudiced view, at this distance of time, and removed as we are from that question of the royal supremacy which so perplexed good men, may now be gained. And he is convinced that such a view will lead to the conclusion, that the very principles by which Sir Thomas More lived, and by which he died, would, had he lived fifty years later, have made him one of the most earnest, as well as the ablest and holiest advocates of a REFORMED CHURCH, as well as a Catholic Faith.

For our justification in asserting what differs somewhat from the popular tradition concerning Sir Thomas More, we propose to give a somewhat extended sketch of a life full of interest, and hope to make no assertions which we cannot justify by the best authorities.

Have we not, when standing upon the ocean beach, observed some poor waif of the sea, a worthless keg, or the fragment of a plank, elevated upon the crest of a huge wave? It might seem, in fancy's vision, to be priding itself on its exaltation. It might seem to be fancying that it had lifted itself up so high, and, poor, worthless thing, to be scorning the great heaving ocean beneath it, as if the wave was made only for it to ride. But the majestic billow grew darker, and swept resistlessly on, till it thundered on the beach, with its deep roar and breaking crash, and then swiftly glided back with soft liquid whispers into the awful depths out of which it came. And then that chip remained stranded on the beach, too mean for a moment's notice. So is it with some who have lived for popularity and a name, and for this have sacrificed principle, duty, and a good conscience. They seemed to ride on the topmost waves of Fortune. But the heaving billows never rest, and a day has come, when these heroes of an hour have been judged by a true standard, and, deserted by popular applause, have been stranded on the sands of Time.

Let us then reverently admire and love, rather, one who, having gained a clear insight into eternal truth and duty, grasps firmly unchanging principles, and, for the sake of that truth, and clinging to those principles, dares, if need be, to live and to die alone. Such a man keeps tight hold of the rock, amidst the shifting sands of expediency, and the breaking billows of popular opinion. The great waves may come, dashing over his head, or they may seem to play kindly around his feet; or they may go back and leave him

alone till another tide come again to overwhelm him. It is the same — such a man is a true hero, though he may never have fought a battle, and mounted to Fame's temple over the mangled bodies of thousands of his countrymen. He may never have ridden triumphantly up to the Capitol with shouts of the crowd, and laurels and flowers strewing his way. But his name, written down by angels' pens, will be a watchword inspiring strength to the doubting, fearing heart. And the recollection of such a man may help to brace heart and arm to strike manfully a new blow in the everlasting contest between Truth and Error, between unchanging principle and the fluctuating calculations of selfish expediency. A man of this mould is no self-conceited fanatic, such as the history of modern days has sometimes shown, puffed up with pride in his fancied election, to be greater, wiser, and better than his fathers, or than the humbly contented wayfarers who journey in the old paths, and who raised high, looks down on his deluded and blinded fellow-creatures. Then when his bubble bursts, he falls so abjectly that one hardly knows whether laughter or weeping better suit the occasion.

We introduce More with this preface, in order to show more plainly what he was by first intimating what he was not. Home is the centre of a true man's life. And to know Sir Thomas More, we must see him at home. We will select, for the epoch, the year of our Lord 1532, a period of brief rest for him, in his fifty-second year. The centre and head of a large family, he is a man not conspicuous in size or feature. You must see the blended intellect and simplicity, the wit and kindness of that clear, sparkling gray eye. You must observe that mouth, as ready for a playful jest as for serious words of judicious counsel, and passing with simple and natural grace from one to the other, before you can know even the exterior of the man. Time is beginning to wear upon him. A constitution not naturally strong has never been prematurely weakened by exhausting dissipations; his mode of living has ever been of the simplest and purest; the wine-cup has rarely gone to his lips except for courteous greeting of his many friends; but he has lived for others with untiring devotion. Burdened with the cares of an empire, for example, when he was the second man in it, he found time to write long and powerfully for what he thought a good cause. But Time traces no wrinkle on his heart. It is a large household within these hospitable doors, to

which the wise and good think it honor to come, and to which the needy, the widow, and the orphan never come in vain. There are three daughters, Margaret, Elizabeth, Cicely, and their younger brother John, all married, the eldest to William Roper, from whose life of his father-in-law many interesting incidents in this sketch are derived. Grandchildren are growing up also, and the orphan has found a daughter's place at the fireside and in the heart of its master. But from oldest to youngest, down to the poorest scullion in the kitchen, he is the centre of all. You cannot tell whether they love or fear him most. The mother, who might have been another centre of gentle love, has long since gone to rest. And More, after decent mourning made, seeing that young girls would sadly need a mother's care, has chosen one for them, not because of her wit, beauty, grace, or riches, but because she will be to his daughters all they need. She is a notable house-keeper, prudent, firm, able to command, and to train up his children in what that loving father cannot. While we are looking at her, so great a contrast, sometimes such an amusing one, with her commonplace, practical mind, very clearsighted concerning expediency, and very dim of sight concerning principle, we may, perhaps, pause a moment. And we cannot but wonder that such a woman, having seen so many years, should, by the force of mere gentleness, and the spirit of chaste and elegant refinement which presided in that home, imbibe something of its spirit, and contribute her share to the common stock of tasteful and refined pleasures by learning to play on lute, spinet, or whatever long-forgotten instruments were touched before the days of pianos. Sometimes amusing, however, is the contrast between this practical mind and those by whom Mistress More is surrounded. A little story which More tells, without however introducing his wife's name, may be worth repeating. There is little doubt that she is the good lady to whom allusion is made. With the business of a nation filling up his days he had found room for science, as well as for literature and the arts: And the doctrine of the sphere was a very necessary point to be settled. And he labored hard to convince this matter-of-fact wife that the world being round, and the centre of gravity being near the centre of it, that point must, therefore, be the lowest; and whichever way we may go in fancy from that point, we must be going up: that is, higher and lower, with respect to the earth in which we live, are only outer and inner.

Every child knows this in these days. In More's age it was a matter for scientific demonstration.

"‘Imagine then,’ the wise man says to his practical wife, ‘a hole bored through the earth. If there were a millstone thrown down, here on this side from our feet, it should finally rest and remain in the very midst of the earth. And though the hole go through, the stone could not fall through, because from the midst it would go outward, and so should ascend higher.’

"Now while he was telling her this tale, she nothing went about to consider his words, but, as she was wont in all other things, studied all the while nothing else but what she might say to the contrary. And when he had at last, with much work, and oft interrupting, brought at last his tale to an end, ‘Come hither, girl!’ she says to the servant at the spinning-wheel, ‘take out this spindle and bring me hither the wheel. Look, sir, ye make imaginations, I cannot tell you what. But here is a wheel, and it is round as the world is; and you shall not need to imagine a hole bored through, for it hath a hole bored through indeed. But yet, because ye go by imaginations, I will imagine with you. Imagine me now that this wheel were ten miles thick on every side, and this hole through it still, and so great that a millstone might well go through it. Now if the wheel stood on one end, and a millstone were thrown in at the other end, would it not go further than the midst, trow you? Tilly vally! tilly vally! If you threw in a stone not bigger than an egg, I ween, if ye stood at the nether end of the hole, five mile beneath the midst, it would give you a pat upon the pate that you would not know what ailed you.’ Words would she none have lacked, though they should have disputed for the space of seven years. Her husband was fain to put aside his sphere, and leave his wife to her wheel."

What she will be in the time of trial which is coming, the future will reveal.

Are we ready now to enter that home whence the strength comes that makes More the simple, true-hearted, unselfish man he is, amidst double-minded, deceitful, self-seeking courtiers in a tyrant's court? Let us go three miles from London, to a spot on the bank of the Thames. You can see the Babel-town across the meadows, from the garden knoll, or from the terrace, and the hum of noisy streets comes softly on the breeze, as if it spoke of peace to that modest mansion. It is neither so small as to be mean for the first lawyer in England, and one of the chief ornaments of letters and of the state, nor so large as to attract the notice of the great, and the envy of the little.¹ Rare flowers are cultivated

¹ Erasmus.

with care in the garden, or within the Hall. And, as we enter, curious things from far-off countries, relics of olden time, birds of brilliant plumage or most tuneful note, the grotesque ape, the petted spaniel, the cabinet of choice minerals, tell that no gentle taste is a stranger there. We may notice, as we cross the lawn, a newer building, at a convenient distance. Thither should we go, we would find library, gallery of paintings, and chapel. For this man, who could scarcely call any moment his own, when the second person in all England, never used to go to his stately barge with its eight rowers, in order to sail to Westminster Hall, or to the Palace, unless he had first gone on his knees with wife, children, and servants, to ask help and pardon during the day. And very often on the day on which his Lord died for us all, he goes to that chapel to spend a large part of the day in study of holy things, and communion with God. A little incident which occurred when More was Lord High Chancellor will illustrate this part of his character. He went home from "the busy nothings" of court to his modest house at Chelsea, and on the holy day was found, as usual, at the parish church. And as choirs then did in England, and sometimes do still, he put on a surplice, and took his place near the choir-boys. A great man of another sort, a noble duke, seeking him on the king's business, found him so employed. Laughing, with a sneer and an oath or two, which we omit: "What, Master More, a parish clerk? You dishonor the King and his office." "Nay," is the quiet answer, "the King will not be offended with me for serving *his* Master."

But let us look again at this model home in Chelsea. There is no idleness in that house. No listless lounging in parlors by young people, wearily trying to kill time; no idle gossip between cook and footman in the kitchen. There is a time for everything, and everything is done in its time. If cook's turnspit has a little leisure he is learning his chant for the chapel; if my lady's maid is dismissed for the morning, her garden bed requires weeding, and she is busy there. For they serve for love as well as for hire. They are my Lord Chancellor's children, and with the authoritative word of a master, he mingles some kind inquiries which make them all go away more briskly to their work. For whatever he may have to do in law, or letters, or the affairs of nations, More says that he will be no stranger at home, but "will talk with his wife, and chat with the children, and say a few words to the servants."

Mistress Margaret, that noble daughter of a noble sire, now married to William Roper, has received a long Latin letter from Erasmus, who would fain hear how his friend is after having borne the honorable toils of office,—his friend who “has shunned office,” he says, “as sedulously as others seek for it;” and modestly proud of the honor, Margaret has left her little boy to his nurse’s care, and seated herself to indite, in Latin, her reply. And there is fever in a neighbor’s cottage, and the adopted orphan is to make ready, and carry there, a quantity of fragrant linen; and another daughter is to prepare some savory jellies for the poor old crones in the almshouse, which More has built and supported, having placed them under Margaret’s care.

Who could imagine, seeing such peace, simplicity, and holiness, what heavy clouds are gathering round the horizon: what fierce lightning’s bolts are ready to tear in pieces all that would be too like Paradise if it could last long? None; unless he could watch More lying sleepless, night after night,¹ weighing the frightful cost to those beloved ones of his steadfast adherence to conscience and principle, and shrinking, with human fear, which his own sensitive organization rendered most painful, from the doom which he must meet. One must go to that chapel, and see him lying prostrate there on the pavement, nerving heart and mind for the great contest, a human heart, not a stoic’s, but a heart that can throb and bleed for others as well as for himself. No fanaticism has he to sustain him; no madness. No applauding thousands will uphold him, and look on ready to avenge his death.

There will be no roar of cannon, and sulphurous smoke, and wild charges of cavalry, sending fire through the veins, and changing the coward into the hero of an hour. Only the daughter, whom he has trained to be a true hero’s child, will come and help him to be strong, seeking for a help which brave men need, as well as women and children. Only the poor he has succored as a lawyer, and the widows and orphans who used to come when he was Lord High Chancellor, and sat in his hall of afternoons to hear their pitiful stories, about very little things which were very great to them, will stand along the streets, by and by, and sorrowfully weep and whisper, “There he goes! how feeble he is! how old and gray-headed he is grown! how he limps weakly along, leaning on his staff!” And then they will shrink back from those tall, fierce halberdiers.

¹ More’s Letters.

But not now ; More knows what must come. He breathes not a word of it to the dear ones at home. He tries by directing their thoughts to things which nerve a Christian's soul in the hour of deadly peril, to prepare them for the day when the storm shall burst upon their heads, and leave them even without that dear roof for shelter. "Is not the road to heaven," he says, "as short even from a gallows as from a feather-bed?" With an innocent artifice he contrives a loud knock, summoning him away from the dinner-table to London. So, when the day shall come, a sorrow foreseen and provided for will be robbed of some of its bitterness. For a single heart like his is more clear-sighted than worldly, double-minded men are able to comprehend. Such persons as he and Erasmus see men in one quarter selling their consciences, and in another, in base fear, servilely giving them up to a tyrant's keeping. Even gentle and pious Cranmer first declares that he means nothing by the act he is going to do, and then solemnly invokes God's name in the oath that he will be true to the Pope and obey him as Christ's vicar. More and Erasmus see the old abuses of monkery which make the Church abhorred, apparently far from any prospect of reformation, and the wildest schemes against Church, state, and society making more noise, and seeming to fill men's ears and thoughts more than any wise and judicious counsels of reform are likely to do. What wonder that they said, "The Anabaptist heresy is spread incredibly. Things are in that state that I must look about for a burying-place where the dead may find quiet, since, as I see, the living cannot."¹

Men will not fight against the tyrant who sits on England's throne, in defense of the rights of conscience. He sees no evidence that he is an avenging angel of Heaven, sent forth to go with fire and sword, and

"Prove his doctrine orthodox,
By apostolic blows and knocks."

He sees no evidence that he is even called to write or speak his heart's convictions. But there is one thing that he can do for them. He will *die* for them. And the storms shall rage more and more after he is dead ! And, long after, the skies shall clear, and the great problem of which, as it seems to me, no one in More's day could see a solution, namely, how the English Church could

¹ Erasmus.

be reformed without being destroyed, shall prove to have been settled by God, and not by man. For from the midst of all that turmoil of conflicting opinions, Erastian, Popish, Lutheran, Zuinglian, Calvinistic, Catholic, the last, apparently the smallest, feeblest of all, shall have appeared a Church, which after all her shortcomings and failures, needs only revival of faith, piety, and charity among her own members, to render her radiant with the light and beauty which Holy Catholic Church was meant to show forever. More, like those of his day, foresees nothing of that. Had he lived as long as Cranmer did, he might have understood some things better. He is not much of a theologian; of some debated questions, he does not positively know what to think. Like many — for example, Cranmer, and the other Reformers — he has changed his views on many points. He would probably adopt Erasmus' words as his own: "If things come to the worst, and the Church totters on both sides, I will fix myself upon the solid rock, until a calm succeed, and I can see which is the Catholic Church!" Of one thing he is sure: that he must act by principle, conscience, and duty, not by changeful expediency, policy, or subserviency to any other. Henry VIII. is claiming what Christ never gave to any man except his own ministers; many, like Cranmer, are found to make the King the source of all authority. More cannot help that. He will not say one word against it, because he can do no good by saying it. He only wants to spend quietly his few remaining days, feeble at best, with himself and with his God. But what if he be not permitted? What if the storm must come howling around that peaceful mansion? What if those tender hearts must shrink, throb, bleed, be racked, on his account? That is worse than death. He can only pray that God may help him: that God may help them.

We will not yet enter upon the dark close of More's life. But two things should be remarked before I go back to the bright spring-time of this good man's life: first, that a single truthful heart, like More's, is transparent as crystal. Such is his homely simplicity, so clear are those letters which show us all his heart, that we do not speak of him from any conjecture. We can substantiate every word. It is the rarest of things, but, in this case, very delightful, to see all the heart of a man, whose life was so public, laid bare in the familiar and loving intercourse with those among whom he always left the best part of himself. The other thing we have to

premise is, that we have presented the life of Sir Thomas in its serious, thoughtful, religious aspects, not because the picture will be the most interesting and dear, but because this better comports with our present object in writing.

Such symmetric excellence as that which marked More's life has no brilliancy to dazzle the eye, no glaring virtues, with equally glaring faults. We gaze on it as on the soft green of the meadow. We only know what peaceful pleasure we have found in it, but scarcely whence the pleasure comes.

His father was of that upper middle class, who are among England's chief stays; wise, faithful, and judicious, he presided, until ninety winters had frozen his life, at the High Court of King's Bench.

His son Thomas was born in Milk Street, London, about the year 1480. That he should send his son to the best school in London, famous old S. Anthony's, and then, to learn gentle manners and win golden opinions, in the capacity of a page, at the palace of Cardinal Morton, the gentle, noble, witty, learned, and pious Archbishop of Canterbury, shows that More was, from infancy, with the best; and though some of us struggle up through difficulties, to honor, success, and even greatness, though sometimes, a poor, wandering child, is brought back after great falls to his father's house, we must confess that symmetric shapeliness of Christian character, as well as whatever makes a man truly great, in good men's eyes, is rather to be looked for where all has been right from the beginning.

It could not be expected that the father should be as eager as the son soon became for the new learning, which was just beginning to make thinking and reading men bestir themselves. Sir John More would rather that his son should keep himself to the dry technicalities of the law, and such a son could not be disobedient. But the young man, who had made it a principle to choose his friends only from the best, eagerly listened to Colet, the founder of the first Protestant school before the Reformation, who was then translating and expounding Holy Scriptures at St. Paul's, London, at a time when Luther was still a monk contending with his own soul, not with the great world without. It was this holy and learned Colet whom More chose for his spiritual counselor, seeking his guidance, and devoutly ordering his life by it.

Young as More was, he was the friend of such men as Tonstall,

Bishop of London, Lily, one of the best Grecians when Greek was the test of a true scholar, Grocine, the first Greek professor at Oxford, and Linacre, who first taught him Greek. When he was only eighteen, Erasmus, the first scholar of the day, was regularly writing to him as to a companion in intellect and letters. In short, it was easy to predict that More would prove, what he soon became, not only the zealous student of letters, but their earnest advocate and generous promoter, even beyond the limit of the small means which his upright honesty permitted him to have. At an age when some young Americans aspire to nothing higher than playing billiards or driving horses, if they leave the compulsory work of every day, More was translating from the new Greek learning, and writing Latin epigrams, of which a critic of those days says: "How smoothly his verses flow; there is nothing hard, nothing rugged, nothing obscure. He is pure, he is witty, he is elegant. I never read a merrier man, but his quips are not biting nor unkind."

Very like a young man, and very characteristic of his pure and devout spirit, already waking to a deep sense of the corruptions of Religion in his day, are his letters to Colet. He writes to his friend, in the absence of the latter from the city, to come back to St. Paul's. For "the preachers there cannot persuade him that they are fit to cure others, when themselves are most sick and crazy." How he used his witty and musical pen against some of the vices and superstitions of his time, the following translation of one of his epigrams will show. We are indebted for this rendering to the "Edinburgh Review:" —

"A squall arose; the vessel's tost;
The sailors fear their lives are lost.
'Our sins! our sins!' dismayed, they cry,
'Have wrought this fatal destiny!'

"A monk, it chanced, was of the crew,
And round him, to confess, they drew:
Yet still the restless ship is tost,
And still they fear their lives are lost.

"One sailor, braver than the rest,
Cries, 'With our sins she's still oppressed:
Heave out that monk, who bears them all,
And then full well she'll ride the squall!'

"So said, so done; with one accord
They threw the caitiff overboard;
And now the bark before the gale
Scuds with light hull and easy sail."

There is a fact noticed by More's biographers which might have little interest but for the glorious future that followed. His father allowed him barely enough for necessary expenses. He had not money enough to mend his shoes, unless he asked his father for it, who required him to account for every penny. But they both lived long enough for him to be thankful to his father that temptations to youthful vices which might have blighted his whole life, had been kept out of his way.

Devout in soul and life as the young man was, we cannot but notice how he avoided the error into which ill-balanced or ill-instructed minds may fall, of an affected singularity in dress or deportment. He knew that Religion is not a peculiar dress worn by the godly, but is that which elevates and consecrates every daily thought, word, and deed. Austere, even to extreme severity, he was, in private, even to the use of those outward mortifications by which the piety of former days sought to copy the apostolic example, "I keep under my body, and bring it into subjection." But the evidences of this were for the most part only discovered accidentally, and late in his life.

In society, he was the most cheerful and sociable, in after years the favorite companion of his accomplished King, the continual host of numbers of delighted guests, and of the best men of every European nation.

The liberal pursuit of letters, then, was the refreshment of his youth, but law was his work. The young man was lecturing on S. Augustine's "*De Civitate Dei*," and gray-headed scholars and divines listened with pleasure and profit; but his post as reader at the Inn must have better pleased his father, who was so anxious to see his son following his steps in the same honorable profession. That he should have been in Parliament in his twenty-second year may pass for what it is worth. But "the beardless boy," as they called him, dared to oppose the seventh Henry's demand for money from the Commons. It was an age when a King's wish might cost a man his head, and when it was the fashion to submit. Yet More did actually, by his ability and eloquence, disappoint the King concerning the money which he expected, not in any youthful foolhardiness, but with a clear insight into his danger, and the reasons for being bold.

Very characteristic of the age is it that his father should be put in prison for the above offense of his son, until £100 were paid.

His son having nothing, could lose nothing. Foxe, Bishop of Winchester, interested himself in the young man, and would have had him restored to the King's favor if he would confess that he had been in error. But he would not. His life was more private, however, and he would have gone abroad had not the King's death released him from all danger.

But he must have already begun to feel what he afterwards said, that earthly ambition is only "gay, golden dreams from which we cannot help awaking when we die."

In that scene in the House of Parliament one Christian hero was shown to the world. From that day forth, whatever happens, we shall know where to find him when duty is in question. The great waves of popular feeling or a powerful tyrant's rage may move as he is going, and may seem to be bearing him resistlessly on, or they may turn with the changeful tide and he may seem to be struggling hopelessly against them. And if these waves drown him at the end, his last look at the light of day ere they go over him will be toward that one quarter on which his eye has ever been fixed; and what if in an instant, though he seem never to have gained an inch all his life long, angels carry him the entire distance?

The first stroke in this life's conflict is more than half the battle. More had been faithful in youth; there was little uncertainty, therefore, concerning the years which were to follow.

In his twenty-sixth year, he married a young wife of good family, Jane Colt by name, brought up in the quiet of a country home, whose character he might form by all the gentle pursuits and cultivated tastes which he himself possessed. More's descendant, Cresacre More, tells a somewhat curious story of his ancestor's marriage, which may, perhaps, have been handed down as a family tradition. It certainly differs somewhat from the ordinary course in such matters.

"One Mr. John Colt, of New Hall, proffering unto him the choice of his daughters, who were young gentlewomen of very good carriage, good complexions, and very religiously inclined, whose honest and sweet conversation and virtuous education enticed Sir Thomas not a little; and although his affection most served him to the second, for that he thought her the fairest and best favored, yet when he thought with himself that it would be a grief and sore blemish to the eldest to have the younger sister preferred before her, he, out of a mind of compassion, settled his fancy upon the eldest."

A short but happy wedded life ensued, in which his only son and three daughters were born. Then he was a widower, choosing after a time, for the sake of his children, that thrifty but worldly and narrow-minded lady, Alice Middleton, of whom we have heard something already, but concerning whom we may add, what Cresacre More, in his gossiping way, tells us, "she was a widow, by whom he had no children, whom he married because she might have care of his children that were young, from whom of necessity he must be often absent. She was of good years, of no good favor nor complexion, nor very rich; by disposition very near and worldly. I have heard it reported that he wooed her for a friend of his; but she answered him that he might speed the better if he would speak in his own behalf."

In the mean time law was still his work, and the liberal pursuit of letters his refreshment, and these, no doubt, were his happiest years. Very soon there was hardly any suit of importance in which he was not engaged.

At thirty-one, he was under-sheriff of London, a very honorable office, that of recorder, perhaps, we would call it, which he refused to make lucrative. A little later he had the very unusual honor of two years reading lectures on law at Lincoln's Inn. He was called to the bench.

Twice he went to Flanders, at the request of the city merchants, in order to straighten their affairs. Once, or oftener, he was sent to Calais with Tonstall, upon state business, to confer with the Archduke Charles, afterward the Emperor Charles V. So his time was all taken up, hearing some causes, managing others, a referee in others, and again judging from the bench; loved, trusted, and popular in every capacity. But never, as he said himself, would he be a stranger at home. He was no friend of strife. By profession a lawyer, he understood and felt the high dignity of his vocation, and reconciled quarrels instead of making them; or, if he could not reconcile, then he pointed out the readiest and most economical way to the settlement of difficulties.

The poor knew where to find counsel in their poverty; the widow and the orphan where to find a friend who would take nothing out of their little purse. But yet he realized the perpetual miracle, as it almost seems, of charity, that the less he took, the more he seemed to have. For his professional income must at length have been equivalent to twenty-five thousand dollars of our day and country.

Twice the King urged him to take a place at court, and he twice refused.

In the midst of the engrossing labors of the law, his literary tastes and studies bore good fruit. He published some sketches of the noble and saintly John Pico della Mirandola, whom he had evidently chosen for his model. This scholarly prince, polished gentleman, and devout Christian, had died shortly before, about the time that More was entering Oxford. One of the greatest linguists of his day, moved by the truths which Savonarola's preaching had impressed upon him, he forsook profane learning to become a student of the Bible. He died too soon for More to know him; but some of Pico's scholars were, no doubt, numbered among More's intimates.

Not much later appeared his life of Richard III., the first specimen, perhaps, of true history in our literature, in correct and elegant English prose.

But "*Utopia*," which appeared when he was about thirty-six, was that which won him fame throughout all Europe. Ever a favorite theme with scholars, the subject which this elegant philosophical romance discusses, was then one which agitates the minds of men everywhere. Not only old notions and forms in Religion were giving way, but the very foundations of society, civilization, government, and order, were shaken. Then was the first trembling of the earthquake before the mighty revolutions, which have since tried many souls, and, once for all, forbidden any educated man to take in blind acquiescence, the principles of any other, without inquiring for himself, into their origin and foundation. "*Utopia*," then, presenting the ideal of a perfect commonwealth, could not but interest men of the world, as well as men of books.

It is not the object of this sketch to note more than that which illustrates the mind and character of Sir Thomas More himself. Suffice it then to say, that he shows himself the great, good man which his life also declared him. He anticipated the best results of modern reflection. In a day, when a King could, almost by a word, sever the writer's head from his body, he dared to say that Kings rule for the benefit of their people, not for their own; and that "their divine right hinders not their Parliament from deposing them for better men, if they prove utterly unfit for their office." While monarchs were planning wars for their own personal glory, he advised them to stay at home, enriching their King-

doms, "endeavoring themselves to love their subjects, and again to be beloved of them." He, who had braved the rage of Henry VII., dared to say that "Kings are richer by their people's wealth than by their own;" that it is the office of a shepherd "to feed his flock, not himself;" and that "the people choose their governors for their own sake, not for his."

In a reign in which over seventy-two thousand criminals are popularly reported to have suffered death, he showed himself two hundred and fifty years in advance of his age, by asserting the punishment to be too severe for the offense, and that certainty is more efficacious than severity; and that true political wisdom would remove the cause of theft by discouraging gambling, idleness, neglect of the peasantry, and other fruitful causes of crime. The rich kept great numbers of attendants, he observed, who were brought up helpless and idle. Lands, which were needed for tillage to furnish food for all, were turned into parks, or used simply for grazing. Remove such causes of evil, and there would be much less crime demanding punishment.

And with reference to the Reformation, and More's relations to it, let us notice now, though it is a question which we shall meet again, that he had reached his thirty-sixth year when his "Utopia" appeared, and that the well meditated views which he therein expressed were never retracted. It was a fool's bauble which gave the rap, but the writer shows that he could not favor those who favored Church abuses. "Nay, ye shall not be so rid and despatched of beggars, unless ye make provision also for us friars," says one of them. "Why," quoth the jester, "that is done already, for my Lord himself set a very good example for you when he decreed that vagabonds should be kept straight, and set to work, for you be the veriest vagabonds that be."

His carefully formed views, never, despite some things which seem otherwise, retracted or changed, were for *toleration* of differences in Religion, if peace and good order could be preserved. This, let us observe now, for we shall meet, by and by, the charges brought against him, by some, of bigoted intolerance, and a persecuting spirit. Among the Utopians, a people unacquainted with the Christian Religion, one person was banished, not for professing himself a Christian, but because he publicly called their acts profane. He was banished, says the author, "not for having *disparaged* their religion, but for his inflaming the people to sedition,

For this is one of their ancientest laws, *that no man should be punished for his Religion.*" He might use persuasion, but was not to mix reproaches nor violence with it. And if he did otherwise, he was to be punished. For More believed, as he said, that "the native force of truth would break forth, at last, and shine bright, if it were managed only by the strength of argument, and with a winning gentleness." Much of the interest which this admirable little book once possessed, has long since been lost; but it will always remain the delight of scholars, and a testimony to the thoughtful goodness of a far-seeing and judicious thinker.

More's home at Chelsea was, during these years, the hospitable resort of learned men of all nations, who were sure of finding there a congenial scholar and friend. One, who saw only his sociable ways, his love of a good story, his genial temper, ready to enjoy whatever was innocent, would not have believed, until some profound observation dropped from his lips, what depths of thoughtfulness were in him; what self-denial, even to austerity, marked his holy inner life: for he was not one of that sort, seen at a later period in the history of Religion, who seemed to think that piety consisted in a certain set of technical expressions, whereby the "truly pious" should recognize one another, as by a kind of spiritual freemasonry. To know what More was, you must have seen him; though loaded down with the business of others, though dispatching in two years, when he had been made Chancellor, the accumulated chancery business of twenty, at the expense of health as well as of comfort, though finding time for liberal pursuits, though writing long treatises in defense of the Church, yet still gathering his family, children, friends, guests, and servants, who were like children in that wonderful household, into the chapel which he had built. There you would have heard him morning and evening reciting with them Psalms, Litany, and Collects; on Fridays spending long hours there. You must have seen him at the altar in Chelsea church. Then you would know where lay the root of his spiritual strength, and how with a merry heart he could tell a good story.

More's children, he thought, must be trained to use every power which God had given them. His home, therefore, was made "a very temple of the Muses," but Muses baptized and sanctified by Christian grace. Erasmus, being bound by religious vows, had no children of his own. But admiring the culture of these, espe-

cially of his fair young correspondent, Margaret, a bachelor's thought came into his mind, "One might envy you," he said, "but that your precious privileges are bound up with so many anxieties. How many pledges you have given to fortune! If they die, you will be tortured the more, for bestowing so much time and pains upon them." "If they must die before me," replied the father, "I would rather they should die learned than unlearned."

It was a lovely sight, such a one as this ruined world never presents very long. A spirit of peace, intelligence, and Christian piety governed all. One grieves even now, after three hundred years have passed, that the wife and mother was not there. The father ruled with supreme sway, but it was with love which softened all strictness, and sweetened every task. Those servants would do anything to please Master More, and could almost commit some little fault, one of them said, to have the privilege of listening to his kind and instructive rebuke.

We wander back from London to Chelsea, to dwell much upon More's home life, for it is easier to be a great man, and to be called a good man, anywhere else. The world says that "No man is a hero to his valet." As we have found such a man, how can we help returning with him to that home where he always leaves his heart? Such as he is there, he will be everywhere. He wrote thus to his children's tutor:—

"Bessie's modesty in her mother's absence, as great as if she had been in presence, I like better than all the epistles [no doubt Latin ones] besides. For I esteem learning which is joined with virtue more than all the treasures of Kings. What doth the fame of being a great scholar bring us, if it be severed from virtue, especially in a woman, whom men will be ready the more willingly to assail for her learning."

More desires for his children "neither praise, nor wealth, nor beauty, but many virtues of the mind, with a little skill in learning."

"I shall account this more happiness than if they were able to attain to Croesus' wealth, with the beauty of fair Helen. Wealth can be taken away; beauty doth fade; and that man's mind must needs be full of unquietness, that always wavers for fear, for fear of other men's judgments, between joy and sadness.

"Keep them from pride. Let them walk through the pleasant meadows of modesty, not to lower the beauty which they have by nature, by neg-

lecting it, nor to make it any more by unseemly arts ; to think virtue their chief happiness, learning and good qualities the next. Neither is there any difference in harvest time whether it were man or woman that first sowed the corn." "For both of them equally bear the name of a reasonable creature, and, therefore, I do not see why learning, in like manner, may not equally agree with both sexes. But if the soil of woman's brain be of its own nature bad, and apter to bear weeds than corn, I am of opinion that woman's wit is the more diligently by good instruction and learning to be tilled, to the end the defects of nature may be redressed by industry.

"Let them learn to place the fruits of their labor in God, and a true conscience ; by which it will easily be brought to pass that, being at peace with themselves, they shall neither be moved with praise of flatterers, nor the nipping follies of unlearned scoffers.

"Love of praise is engrafted in our tender minds, even by our nurses, as soon as we are crept out of our shells. It is fostered by our masters ; it is nourished and perfected by our parents ; while nobody propoundeth any good thing to children ; but they presently bid them expect praise as the whole reward of virtue. Besides their Sallust, teach them these things."

What More says does not end merely in words. Long afterwards, when Margaret had become such a cultivated woman as the world rarely sees, when, in the judgment of the first scholar of that day, her Latin and Greek letters were admirable equally for style and for sense, More still could say to her, "You esteem myself and your husband sufficient and ample theatre for you to content yourself with." Zealous advocate of the highest views of a woman's education, he would have had no sympathy with those "strong-minded women" who think any place but home their proper sphere.

It is delightful to read how such a father writes to such children — his "school," he called them, — how he mixed cheer and gravity together, and, lest the taste of their medicine should disgust them, diluted and sweetened it.

These letters, be it observed, belong to a somewhat later period of his life, when that loving father could steal away from court, and others' affairs, only once or twice a month, to that lovely home at Chelsea. But it is not by annals in chronological order that a man's life is best and most truly depicted.

"Thomas More to his whole school sendeth greeting. Behold how I have found out a way to salute you all, and spare time and paper which

would be very superfluous, because you are all so dear unto me, some in one respect, some in another, that I can omit none of you unsaluted. Yet I know not whether there can be any better motive why I should love you, than because you are scholars; learning seeming to bind me more strictly unto you than the nearness of blood.

"If I loved you not exceedingly, I should envy this your so great happiness to have had so many great scholars for your masters. For I think that Mr. Nicolas is with you also, and that you have learned from him much astronomy. So that I hear you have proceeded so far in this science, that you now know not only the Pole star and Dog and such like of the common constellations, but also, which argueth an absolute and cunning astronomer, in the chief planets themselves, you are able to discern the sun from the moon. Go forward, therefore, with this your new and admirable skill. In the meanwhile I admonish you also to think of this holy fast of Lent. Let your minds also penetrate heaven, lest when the body is lifted up on high, the soul be driven down to the earth with the brute beasts. Farewell. From the court, the 23d of March."

Again More writes, thanking them for their Latin letters, but he likes John's the best. Poor John! Not as clever as his sisters, of him his father is reputed to have said, "We wanted a boy, and now we have one, who will be a boy all his life." John, therefore, shall have the most encouragement. He answers his father very wittily, but shows that he is mindful with whom he is jesting, to wit, his father, whom he endeavoreth so to delight, that he is afraid also to offend. He that daily bent his knee in deepest reverence to his venerable father, before he took his seat as judge, means that his boy shall be such a son also. Then More adds that he must have a Latin letter every day, from every one, either about their studies, or their plays, or, he says:—

"When you have nothing to write of, write as largely as you can of that nothing. Than which nothing is more easy for you to do, especially being women, and therefore prattlers by nature. But take great pains with every word. By this your diligence, you will procure that these your trifles will seem serious matters, for nothing is so pleasing but may be made unsavory by prating garrulity; so nothing is by nature so unpleasant that by industry may not be made full of grace and pleasantness."

So again, to interest his "school" and encourage them with their Latin, their father, resting at a roadside inn, after the mud and rain of a hard day's travel, indited a pretty little epistle in Latin verse.

"Quatuor una meos inuisat epistola natos,
 Servat, et incolumis a patre missa salus;
 Dum peragratur iter, pluviique madescimus imbre;
 Dumque luto implicitus sæpius hæret equus;
 Hoc tamen interea vobis excogito carmen,
 Quod gratum, quamquam sit rude, spero pre;
 Colligisse animi licet huic documento paterni
 Quanto plus oculis vos amet ipse suis;
 Quem non putre solum, quem non male turbidus aer,
 Exiguus que altis trans equus actus aquas,
 A vobis poterant divellere, quo minus omne
 Se memorem vestri comprobet esse loco;
 Nam celso dum nutat equus, casumque minatur,
 Condere non versus desinit ille tamen.
 Inde est vos ego quod soleo pavisse placenta
 Mitra, cum pulchris et dare mala piris
 Inde quod et *sericum* lætis ornare solebam;
 Quod nunquam potui vos ego flere pati,
 Scitis enim quam crebra dedi oscula, verbera rarum;
 Flagrum pavonis non nisi cauda fuit
 Hunc tamen admovi, timideque et molliter ipsam,
 Ne vibex terreras signet amara natis.
 Ah! ferus est, dicique pater non ille meretur
 Que lacrymas nati non fleat ipse sui."

But long years afterwards, the perennial fountain of love had not been frozen, nor had the hot air of courts dried it up. Let one more letter addressed to Margaret witness to that.

"You ask money, dear Meg, of your father, who is both desirous to give it you, and your letter hath deserved it, which I could find in my heart recompense, not as Alexander did by Cherilaus, giving him for every verse a phillipine of gold; but if my ability were answerable to my will, I would bestow two crowns of pure gold for every syllable thereof. Here I send you as much as you requested, being willing to have sent you more; but that as I am glad to give, so I am anxious to be asked and fawned on by my daughters, thee especially, whom virtue and learning hath made most dear unto me. Wherefore, the sooner you have spent this money well, as you are wont to do [no doubt part of it went to the asylum which her father had founded and put under her care], and the sooner you ask me for more, the sooner know you will do your father a singular pleasure.

"Farewell, my most beloved daughter."

Was Lord Stanhope the English statesman who was seen, for a long time one evening, buried in deep thought, and then heard to exclaim two or three times, "It is impossible! it is impossible!" "What, my Lord, is impossible?" "For a statesman to be an honest man." If he had remembered More he might have confessed that the honest courtier, the conscientious statesman, had

lived at his own court. More would, indeed, have been out of place at any court; least out of place, perhaps, in the sunrising of that splendid one of Henry VIII., which showed such a gilded surface over the rottenness pervading society, before it was itself dimmed with blood-red clouds, and sank in filth and shame. But there was a noble court in Henry's best days, and it might have tempted More, if anything could. There was a King delighting in good books, and good men; no mean scholar and artist *himself*, he appreciated and rewarded artists and scholars. There was a cardinal at the helm of state, whose princely show was no empty display, but the splendid garniture of a princely patron of arts and letters. Queen Catharine was, for her sex, a wonder of letters; pious, and of altogether lovely character. Such men as Tonstall wore the mitre, and were in the Privy Council; such men as Linacre, one of the first of the Grecians, were high in favor at court; and such men as Erasmus spoke enthusiastically in its praise. Yet More thought of courts but as "splendid misery and the mask of happiness, and that those who belong to them spend precious time in busy trifles and vain contentions." But after two refusals, he was pressed into the royal service, declining office as earnestly as most men are accustomed to seek for it.

More's outer life from his thirty-seventh to his fiftieth year will be soon sketched.

He was made Master of Requests, called into the King's Privy Council, and knighted. He is said to have expressed himself at the time, to one of his best friends, in some such words as these:—

"I am come to the court extremely against my will, as everybody knows, and as the King himself often twitteth me in sport first; and hereto do I hang so unseemly as a man, not using to ride, doth sit unhandsonely in the saddle. But our prince, whose special and extraordinary favor towards me I know not how I shall ever be able to deserve, is so affable and courteous to all men, that every one who has never so little hope of himself may find somewhat whereby he may imagine that he loveth him; even as the citizens' wives of London do, who imagine that our Lady's picture near the Tower doth smile upon them as they pray before it. But I am not so happy that I can perceive such fortunate signs of deserving his love, and of a more abject spirit than that I can persuade myself that I have it already; yet such is the virtue and learning of the King, and his daily increasing industry in both, that by how much the more I see his Highness increase in both these kingly ornaments, by so much the less troublesome this courtier's life seemeth unto me."

The next year we find him Treasurer of the Exchequer, and at Calais, where he is working himself to death, and that for objects, or in trifles with which he has little sympathy, and for which he has as little taste.

Five years after, being then not far from his forty-third year, he was chosen Speaker of the House of Commons. Very unwillingly did he assume the office, knowing that it would be expected of him that he would lead these complaisant gentlemen almost whithersoever Wolsey bade him. But when he saw that there was no escape, in a manner equally modest and shrewd, he requested freedom of speech for the members. And so Cardinal Wolsey found More a match for himself. The Cardinal was baffled in carrying out some of the arbitrary measures of the court, and only knew that he had failed. Equally characteristic of More and of the age is the scene, as one describes it who was present. The craven submission of a few years later was not yet fully established, and the Commons would still talk and debate. Wolsey had even been heard to complain that measures proposed by the Crown were debated in every ale-house. So he sent word to the Commons that he would appear in person to communicate the King's wishes. More moved that it would not be amiss to entertain him with all his retinue. So the lordly Cardinal came with princely pomp to say that a twenty per cent. income tax was wanted. All, abashed, made no reply. The Cardinal, in his imperative way, addressed one and another; received the highest respect; could not complain of the overwhelming reverence. More, at length, being demanded why the Cardinal had no answer, bending the knee, as the manner was, replied that they were profoundly abashed by the greatness of their visitor. As for himself, he had no authority to answer by himself for the whole body. So the Cardinal withdrew, smothering, as best he could, his helpless indignation. But, like other crafty statesmen, he tried to resort to an embassy, as a means for getting this unaccommodating and too honest courtier out of his way. The smothered indignation found vent, however, in their more private conference. "Would to God you had been in Rome when I made you Speaker, Master More!" "Your Grace not offended, so would I, too, my lord, for I have often wished to visit it."

Two years after, More was made Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster. About the same time we find him on the Continent,

as one of the Commissioners appointed to treat with those of the Regent of France.

Similar embassies followed several times, in which he was engaged. He was in Flanders in 1527; at Cambray, with Bishop Tostall, to treat with the Emperor and the King of France, in 1529, when he reached his fiftieth year and entered on his brief work as Lord High Chancellor.

How shall we express in few words the spirit of these years? We might try to say what it was not; we might try to say what it was. It was not that of Wolsey's nor Cromwell's life. What the poet makes Wolsey preach, that More practiced:—

"Be just and fear not;
Let all the ends thou aim'st at be thy country's,
Thy God's, and Truth's; then, if thou fall'st,
Thou fall'st at a blessed martyr."

Most truly says one, "Thus did it by his doing, throughout the whole course of his life appear, that all his travail and pains, without respect of any earthly commodities, either to him, or to any of his, were only upon the service of God, the prince, and the realm, wholly bestowed."

To cite all the illustrations of this, which might be furnished, would be tedious. Let it suffice to refer to one well known. More was not rich. He had a large household, and lived generously, as a man of letters, and a patron of all liberal arts. Money, therefore, was not a matter of indifference to him; and his embassy to the Netherlands, no inconsiderable honor, as the world names such things, depriving him of his professional income, well entitled him to a pension, especially as he had made great sacrifices in attending to it. But the single heart and pure conscience see further than double-minded men suppose. The patriot statesman feared. He dared, in that corrupt age, to live according to his conscience, and some question would some day arise concerning royal privileges. He would not have his hands tied by any obligations to the King; and so the pension was refused.

Such men as Wolsey, whose highest law is expediency, found such a character an incomprehensible mystery, as incomprehensible as his daring in sometimes opposing the Cardinal in the Privy Council, foolishly daring to have an opinion of his own, when wise men had none. The Cardinal, very naturally, called such a man a fool. And very characteristic of More's peaceful soul was his

reply, "I thank God that our lord the King hath but one fool in his Council."

So agreeable a companion, whose genial wit enlivened, but never wounded its auditors, could not be spared from the King's own company. Henry's rapid downfall had not yet commenced to show with what headlong speed it could soon be consummated. He delighted in More's society, and when the Privy Councilor could not be brought to the palace, the King would even go to him. And again, as ever, this true heart saw through every cloak in which falsehood or pride could wrap itself. He was not carried away with the honor of a King walking in his garden, and affectionately throwing his arm around his subject. More said to Margaret's husband, "I tell thee, son Roper, if my head would win him a castle in France, it would not fail to go."

Here let us end this part of our sketch; in these words of More we have a very appropriate motto for the next. Yet we may not overlook the well known letter, so full of his usual kindness, in which, about this time, he writes to his wife, concerning the burning of his barns, along with some of his poor neighbors' cottages.

"Maistres Alyce, in my most harty wise I recommend me to you; & whereas I am enfourmed by my son Heron of the losse of our barnes & of our neighbours' also, with all the corn that was therein, albeit (saving God's pleasure) it is gret pitie of so much good corne lost, yet sith it hath liked him to sende us such a chaunce, we must & are bounden, not only to be content, but also to be glad of his visitacion. He sente us all that we have loste, & sith he hath by such a chaunce taken it away againe, his pleasure be fulfilled. Let us never grudge ther at, but take it in good worth, and hartely thank him, as well for adversitie as for prosperite. And peradventure we have more cause to thank him for our losse, then for our winning; for his wisdom better seeth what is good for vs than we do our selves. Therefore I pray you be of good chere, & take all the howsold with you to church, & there thanke God, both for that he hath given us, & for that he hath taken from us, & for that he hath left us, which if it please hym he can increase when he will. And if it please hym to leave us yet lesse, at his pleasure be it.

"I pray you to make some good ensearche what my poore neighbours have loste, & bid them take no thought therfore: for, & I should not leave myself a spone, there shal no pore neighbour of mine bere no losse by any chaunce happened in my house. I pray you be with my children & your howshold mery in God. And devise somewhat with your frendes

what waye wer best to take, for provision to be made for corne for our howsold & for sette thys yere comming, if ye thinke it good that we kepe the ground stil in our handes. And whether ye think it good that we so shall do or not, yet I think it were not best sodenlye thus to leave it all up, & to put away our folk of our farme, till we have somewhat advised us thereon. Howbeit if we have more nowe then ye shall nede, & which can get them other maisters, ye may then discharge us of them. But I would not that any man were sodenlye sent away he wote nere wether.

"At my comming hither I perceived none other but that I shold tarry still with the Kinges Grace. But now I shal (I think), because of this chance, get leave this next weke to come home & see you: & then we shal further devise together uppon all thinges, what order shal be best to take. And as thus as hartely fare you well with all our children as ye can wishe. At Woodestok, the thirde daye of Septembre, by the hand of your loving husbnde

"THOMAS MORE, *Knight.*"

Sir Thomas More stood on the slippery pinnacle of human grandeur, but for a brief space.

They that stand there may fall, as he well knew, and, as Wolsey's disgrace had taught him, into tremendous depths, whence none rise again. But he was a just man, that dared to do right at a time when the men who surrounded Henry were becoming remarkable only for servility, dishonesty, covetousness, and profligacy. And is it not written of such as he: "He shall give his angels charge concerning thee, and in their hands they shall bear thee up, lest thou dash thy foot against a stone?"

We have reached October, 1529, when More, after humbly imploring Divine Grace, and receiving, as he was wont, the Holy Communion, avoiding honor and responsibility as long as he could, took them like a true man, when duty compelled. With words, which coming from a truthful heart are, we think, without a parallel in political history, he seated himself in the chair of the Lord High Chancellor, Keeper of the King's Seal, the second man in the kingdom, the king's right hand.

He modestly disclaimed the compliments which the Duke of Norfolk had paid him.

"This weight," said he, "is hardly suitable to my weak shoulders. This honor is not correspondent to my deserts. It is a burthen, not a glory; a care, not a dignity. The one, therefore, I must bear as manfully as I can, and discharge with as much dexterity as I shall be able.

"As you do hope for great matters, and the best at my hands, so, though I dare not promise any such, yet do I promise truly and affectionately to perform the best I shall be able."

When Sir Thomas had spoken these words, turning his face to the high judgment seat of the chancery, he proceeded in this manner—a good man often becomes prophetic because he has learned the principles of eternal truth which will direct the future, as they have guided the past:—

"But when I look upon this seat; when I think how great and what kind of personages have possessed this place before me; when I call to mind who he was that sat in it last of all; a man of what singular wisdom, of what notable experience, what a prosperous and favorable future he had for a great space; and how, at last, dejected with a heavy downfall, he hath died inglorious, I have cause enough, by my predecessor's example, to think honor but slippery, and this dignity not so grateful to me, as it may seem to others. For both it is a hard matter to follow with like paces or praises a man of such admirable wit, prudence, authority, and splendor, to whom I may seem but as the lighting of a candle, when the sun is down. And also the sudden, unexpected fall of so great a man as he was, doth terribly put me in mind that this honor ought not to please me too much, nor the lustre of this glittering seat dazzle mine eyes. Wherefore, I ascend this seat as a place full of labor and danger, void of all solid and true honor, the which by how much the higher it is, by so much the greater fall I am to fall. This will I have still before mine eyes, that this seat will be honorable, famous, and full of glory to me, if I shall, with care and diligence, fidelity and wisdom, endeavor to do my duty, and shall persuade myself that the enjoying thereof may chance to be but short and uncertain; the one whereof my labor ought to perform, the other my predecessor's example may easily teach me."

Did Henry remember what he told this faithful servant when he first compelled him to serve the state, "Look to God first, then to me, your King?" Time soon showed.

More was Chancellor at a time when the spirit of Nero's wish concerning Rome seemed to be fulfilled, for there appeared to be not only one single head, but one single will and conscience in the Kingdom, and that, the King's. The people, lords, bishops, clergy, commons, seemed ready to fall meekly on their faces, and lick the dust from "their most noble liege lord's," the dread monster's feet. The readiness with which they passed from one step to another, seeming all the while to speak from heart and conscience,

while will and conscience were yielded to the bidding of an impure and self-willed tyrant, astonishes us more and more.

Henry says, "Catharine, the partner of my bosom for twenty years, is faithless; Anne Boleyn shall be queen," and the murmur arises from the dust where the whole realm is lying, though some of their hearts must have quaked at the conscious falsity which their acts, before, or afterwards, revealed, "Most dread and religious master, we are your humble servants, it is all true." Again that "most religious" master speaks, "Anne Boleyn, the queen, is faithless, and has been plotting against my life." "It is all true, most awful master," is the answer from beneath his feet. "She was no queen at all, and her child is illegitimate," says Henry, not troubling himself to reconcile this with the former charge. "Most awful and religious monarch, true, she never was queen; let her die. This day, on which she is to suffer, permit us to present the petition (which he had ordered them to make), that you will marry the Lady Jane Seymour, whom you have already chosen." Happy lady! death soon removed her from the court of Henry. Forthwith, Anne of Cleves is duly married, and Cranmer has written with his own hand, in the case of Queen Catharine, that a marriage ceremony is in itself binding and irrevocable. But Henry says: "I do not want her." "We are your majesty's most devoted servants. Condescend to favor us, and take another;" and the poor lady, afraid of losing her head, writes to her brother accordingly, and gives her assent to a divorce; until finally, as if tired of half-way measures, the voice from the representatives of a realm, laid at this monster's feet, comes to his ears, bearing words in substance such as these: "May it please your majesty, supreme over our souls and bodies, to bequeath this noble realm of England to whomsoever you please."

Henry pronounces that Lutherans shall be burnt, and the parliamentary echo repeats it, "burnt." "Papists shall be burnt," decides the King, with even-handed justice. "Anabaptists shall go to the stake along with them." And even the gentle Cranmer is found ready to carry out the decree.

The King ordered a Parliament to be chosen in 1539. His message to the University of Cambridge, directing it whom to choose, comes too late; they have already chosen two others. But what then? With incredible docility, they call the few electors together, cancel their own election, and choose those whom the King wants.

And it was such a Parliament as that which resolved that the King should be desired to put forth, by proclamation, such articles of faith as he should decide upon, which should be enforced without further statute, and for disregarding which men might burn at the stake.

Such an epoch appears to me to be one of those which rarely come in the history of nations, when a people is startled out of its slumbers in old and corrupted habits and opinions. Some great moral earthquake shakes a land. The walls of men's habitations seem to be cracking and tottering to their fall. Half awake, half slumbering, they know not what to do; and blindly, like a flock of sheep, they follow the first guide of strong will and clear head, who calls to them, "Come this way. For your lives, come."

At such a moment was More made Chancellor. Any man whose life had not been one of truth, honesty, and singleness of purpose, would soon have involved himself in complexities and inconsistencies; so that his certain and speedy fall would have been one of dishonor and irretrievable shame.

Even the gentle and pious Cranmer did not keep himself pure from those stains which are sure to defile men of unstable purpose. For even he too often tried, in these dark days, to guide his course by the two compasses which pointed to opposite quarters of the heavens, principle and expediency.

Well says Henry Giles, in one of his lectures, "A man of such purity of purpose," as Thomas More, "wishes to do right, and in most cases he does it. He may err, but it is by mistake of judgment, not by perversity of intention. It is never the complexity of matters without, but it is the complexity within, insincerity, double-mindedness, principles held only so far as interest does not contradict them; these things disturb men. If the aims of a life be right, it cannot, in details, be much amiss."

Such was the spirit of More's chancellorship. The pure truth, justice, and charity which had adorned a lower station, shine only more brightly in a higher place. He threw himself, with all his might, into the work of his office. And though that high court of equity was clogged with lawsuits of twenty years standing, at the end of two years, there was not one.

It is possible that some young Americans will consider his manners, in some respects, very much out of date. Indeed, they are quite as old as the time of Moses and the fifth commandment.

That the Lord High Chancellor, on his way to the court, should come into the hall, where his father was presiding at his Court of King's Bench, and, before he entered on the duties of the day, should kneel before the venerable old man of ninety winters, to receive his paternal blessing, may, perhaps, indicate something more than a change of manners, when contrasted with the irreverence too common among American children. What it indicates is well worthy of consideration.

More did not forget in higher duties the lowlier paths of charity. The poor, the widow, and the orphan knew that they had one friend in high places. In that pleasant hall at Chelsea, where the Lord Chancellor sat of afternoons, one, as willing as able to help, was lending a ready ear to every complaint. Very much is implied in the familiar story of the beggar-woman and her dog. It lets us into the company, homely, kindly, and condescending, of one long since departed to his reward.

The beggar's little poodle was her only treasure. But alas for her! he was gone, lost for many days, till, through the picket fence, she espied him in the garden of the Lord High Chancellor, now become the petted favorite of the great man's wife. "But," she thought, "is not that hall open to every one? Why should not I go in and make complaint about my dog?" So in she went with her story. And the Chancellor's gray eye beamed with a kind merriment, as he directed Lady More, very loath to part with her new pet, to take her place, as became her state, at the head of the hall, while the beggar remained at the door. Then the poodle was brought and placed by the Chancellor. Each claimant, in turn, called to the dog, and, true democrat that he was, altogether disregarding the lady's quality, he sprang to the beggar. Lady More, however, was satisfied, and all was made smooth, when the beggar received a piece of gold sufficient to buy her three such dogs, while the poodle remained in more respectable company.

For reasons which must be considered hereafter, More stood by his Church in those questions of doubt and trouble, in which her own errors and backslidings had involved her. He was not rich; honors, which would have enriched others, had kept him poor. It was not strange, therefore, that in convocation, bishops, abbots, and clergy, should desire to present him, as a testimonial for his laborious and able writings, with forty-five thousand pounds, which

in those days was a munificent sum. But More's reply could be none other than what it was: "I would rather it were cast into the sea, than either I, or any of mine, should have thereof the worth of a penny; for though your offer, my lords, be indeed very friendly and honorable, yet set I so much by my pleasure, and so little by my profit, that I would not, in good faith, have lost the rest of so many a night's sleep spent upon the same, for much more than your liberal offer. And yet wish would I, for all that, upon condition that all heresies were suppressed, that all my books were burned, and my labors utterly lost."

More had indeed great need of that directness and purity of aim, which had marked his previous life. He might, for example, have taken presents, while he held office, as others did, before and after him. But when the time of trouble came, then we should have heard the virtuous indignation of his enemies crying out against him. He might have found, also, more than one lucrative situation for his own relatives. But if he erred at all, he was determined to err on the safe side. And very memorable is the reply he made to his son-in-law, lightly complaining that all profited by the Chancellor, except his own family. "Wolsey's friends," he said, "get gains by means of the chancellorship, and so might Master More's; but you are ready to hear all, rich and poor, so that instead of our gaining friends and money, by introducing people to the Chancellor, every one can go for himself." "I may do you or your friends," replied he, "good in other ways. But if the parties will call for justice, though my father, whom I dearly love, were on the one side, and the devil, whom I as sincerely hate, on the other, his cause being just, the devil should have right."

* Such a man could no more be suspected of soiling his hands with bribes, than the sun could be suspected of being defiled by the mists which rise up from the earth. But let us not forget the difference between the nineteenth century and the sixteenth. Justice was a very arbitrary thing. And that a chancery suit which had been waiting twenty years should be hastened by a respectful present to the Chancellor, or to some one of his dependants, was no strange thing. Indeed we may have heard of something similar in these better days. But when the time came, which we have almost reached, when More's enemies would have been right glad if such a charge could have been brought against him, then was

it shown that the pure in heart walk unharmed through snares, into which the double-minded fall to their utter ruin. We may be sure that Anne Boleyn's father, Lord Wiltshire, was not the least eager to find good ground for bringing into trouble the man who could never condemn himself, before his own conscience, by confessing that he thought the King's divorce from the faithful partner of twenty years a lawful act. The time soon came when enemies were free to accuse the late Lord Chancellor of what they would. What good news, then, was the story of the gilt cup which More had received from the wife of some one who had a suit in chancery. "Yes," said More, when this was brought up against him, "Yes, as a New Year's gift, and long after the decision of the case was published." "You hear, my lords, Master More owns to have received the gilt cup." "But, will you not hear the rest, my lords? It is true, after much solicitation, I did receive the cup; yet I had it filled with wine, and pledged Mrs. Vaughan in it, as she did me. And then I did present it back again to her husband, for his New Year's gift."

A certain glove, too, filled with gold, came to More, for a gift; and he accepted the glove, but "not liking the lining," he returned that.

The great trial of the day, the test of every Englishman who was of enough consequence to be submitted to such a test, had reached its crisis. Immense as, we now see, were the spiritual interests involved, it seems that Henry's passion for the handsome maid of honor was, in his eyes, of more consequence; or at least, became his ruling motive. Every Englishman must be found on one side or the other, and More was not allowed to keep his conscientious convictions locked up in his bosom.

Some time before More's chancellorship, the King had sent for him, in order to submit his scruples, hoping, no doubt, to get from More the opinion which would be most agreeable to himself. More was not one of those fanatics who are forever plunging themselves into hot water, doing no good to any one thereby, and only scalding themselves. He looked through the King's heart, for such a pure soul will often read such men, and his only answer was, that the matter was not for him. But when he was pressed to hear and read opinions, he modestly referred the matter to wiser heads, pointing out the fathers of the Church, as independent and impartial counselors for the King.

But Henry had found that there was often a great change in men's views when they looked at things from the chair of office. Why might it not be so with More? Henry, too, it must be confessed, was a shrewd judge of men's characters; knew who could best fill an important place, and was restrained by no undue regard for nobility from giving office to the best man, even though he had no title of nobility to recommend him. So he had made More his Chancellor. But he found the man's heart and conscience just what they had been before. "Honors may change manners," said More to Lord Manners, in his Latin pun, "*sed honores non mutant mores.*"

Henry, indeed, for a time made the best use he could of such an inconvenient Privy Councilor. He trusted the question of his divorce to more satisfactory advisers. But the conscientious statesman soon felt that his post was no place for him, and that he would be compelled to choose between the King's conscience and his own soul. The King had again brought before him the marriage question. His reply was, that he would willingly assist his sovereign; but Henry himself had bidden him first to look unto God. The King was content, and would ask others of his council. When the decision of the Universities in favor of the divorce had been obtained, More was commanded to go, with others of the Council, to the Commons, and lay the decision before them. He did so, and then begged his master to consider how hard work was making him old before his time; and Henry, rather glad to be rid of such an inconvenient conscience, let him go home to Chelsea. October, 1529, he had received the King's seal; May, 1532, he surrendered it.

With characteristic simplicity and homely dignity, he wearily laid aside the burdensome trappings of office. "Freed from the cares of office," he said, "I can now have some time to live for God and for myself." The tiresome retinue of attendants was gone. We are made to see vividly the whole scene by the pleasant little story told us of More's wife at Chelsea church. There is no one any more to please the worldly wife by standing at the pew door with lowly reverence, saying, "Madame, my lord is gone." And, with cheerful smile, Sir Thomas, Chancellor no more, stands at the pew door himself, and bowing says: "Madame, my lord is gone."

The good lady, however, is thoroughly out of humor. "Tilly

vally, tilly vally, Master More, will you sit still by the fire and make goslings in the ashes with a stick, as children are wont to do? For as my mother was wont to say, heaven rest her soul! it is ever better to rule than to be ruled. And, therefore, I would not, I warrant you, be so foolish as to be ruled when I might rule." "By my troth, wife, in this, I dare say, you say truth; for I never found you willing to be ruled yet."

There is no answering Mistress Alice's argument; so the late Lord Chancellor falls to criticizing his wife's dress. But the daughters declare it to be all right; and then he adds, "Do you not perceive that your mother's nose is somewhat awry?" whereat the good lady, even in her ill humor, begins to see that in matters of conscience, though she does not understand so sensitive a nature, she will do well to let it alone.

And this was the end of an honest man's career of honor, and twenty-five years' acquaintance with the splendid court of the eighth Henry. In gold and silver he had about one hundred pounds, and of income, about the same; for, above the King's gifts, which indeed were very soon gone again, he had not purchased land enough to yield over £50 per annum.

He called his family about him. "We will now try Lincoln's Inn diet," said he, "and if that is too much for our slender purse, then New Inn fare, wherewith many an honest man is well contented. If that exceed our ability, then will we, in the next year, descend to Oxford fare; which, if our ability stretch not to maintain neither, then may we yet go a begging, and so still keep company, and be merry together."

So we have reached once more the point from which we started. More, broken down in health, with some deep-seated disease of the chest, was at rest in Chelsea. His course was run. There only remained the last struggle to keep a good conscience, in dark and perilous days, and then the victor's crown.

This is a pleasing ideal of a good man's life. But where are the shadows in this bright picture? There have been many who opposed his principles to point them out. We will endeavor to give an impartial view of them in a subsequent Article.

ART. II.—SHALL WE EVER HAVE A CHRISTIAN PHILOSOPHY?

- I. *Bekker's Plato.*
- II. *Locke's Essay on the Human Understanding.*
- III. *Reid's Works*, by HAMILTON.
- IV. *Kant's Critic of Pure Reason.*
- V. *Cousin's Psychology. Review of Locke's Essay on the Human Understanding.*
- VI. *Sir William Hamilton's Metaphysics.*
- VII. *Mansel's Limitations of Religious Thought.*
- VIII. *The Supernatural in Relation to the Natural.* By JAMES McCOSH, LL. D.
- IX. *Tyndall's Heat considered as a Mode of Motion.*

THERE are those who think Philosophy of no use except to amuse idlers who might otherwise be engaged in something worse. There are those who think it the source of *all* our knowledge, whether of things in Heaven or of things on Earth. And there are those who regard it as the cause of all our errors in Religion, of all the unbelief and misbelief of whatever name or kind since the days of the Apostles.

If, now, for the word "*Philosophy*" we might substitute "*philosophizing*," we should probably agree with the latter of the three classes referred to, and leave the other two to settle the account as might best suit themselves. For it is a fact that what is called "*Philosophy*" has been the prolific parent of every system of heresy and unbelief that has been proposed or prevalent in Christendom since those days of the Apostles, when some had been "*spoiled by Philosophy and vain deceit.*" And conversely, it is true that no system of Philosophy has been propounded and accepted by any considerable number of thinkers, that has not brought forth some species of religious error, some form of unbelief or misbelief.

In view of these facts, many there are who would put a ban upon Philosophy, and exclude it from among the reputable studies. Nay, it has been declared to be the very "*tree of knowledge*" planted in Eden, the eating of which was the first act of disobedience, and that it thus became the essence of all sin, the parent of all our woes, so that even in our age any attempt at what is called philosophizing is but a repetition of that old transgression.

We may as well be a little elementary, and say plainly what we mean by Philosophy and philosophizing. Any inquiry into the meaning and importance of a fact, any seeking for an explanation of an obvious phenomenon, is philosophizing about it; and the result of our inquiry, whether right or wrong, will be our Philosophy concerning it; if it be right, it becomes a means to further knowledge, a premise to other conclusions, and so on to the highest attainments of which the human mind is capable. If it be wrong, it will only lead to error in regard to other matters, and thus show the falsity of our theory of the facts by the absurdity of the practical application to which it leads. But any attempt to go beyond an observed fact, and either seek an explanation or draw from it an inference, is an example of philosophizing.

Now, in reference to Theology we have this inevitable condition. We assume that Theology is based on Revelation. But as Revelation itself raises the question of the existence of God, His personality and attributes, the nature of miracles and their possibility, their efficiency as proof of divine interposition, these questions must be settled *in some way* before we can accept or reject the Bible as the Word of God. And we have this other fact also, that in all our country we have schools and colleges for the training of the minds of the young in scientific knowledge and the methods of science. These methods they are taught to regard as worthy of their confidence, or true; nay, more, as infallible; and when, therefore, we ask them to accept the Bible as the Word of God, they naturally ask, "How does this belief agree with your teaching? Can we, in the exercise of the principles and in the application of the methods you have been inculcating, receive the Bible as the Word of God, and the Theology you teach us as a Revelation from Him? If so, well and good; we shall of course do it; for we have acquired the utmost confidence in those principles and methods. They have served us well thus far, and we have never, in all our experience, found them at fault in any one single instance. But if what you ask us to do requires that we shall abandon these principles or act in contradiction to them, we must, as consistent, self-respecting men, wait until we can get time to examine the grave questions implied in the course you ask us to take. We must see what the new principles are, whither they would lead, and why those we have been accustomed to are to be repudiated. The demand is in itself suspicious, and all the more to be distrusted

because all history is full of examples of priestcraft demanding of people a renunciation of their Reason in order that they might be made dupes of most unreasonable delusions and imposture."

We are prepared to admit that this position is in itself right, although of course it may have been made in bad faith in numberless instances, and persisted in most unreasonably in others, and from sinister motives. What we mean, therefore, in admitting that the position of the skeptic is correct, is, simply that the child has a right to expect that as he advances from his first lessons to his last act of faith, he shall find this to result from a *continuous course*, that the rules of multiplication and addition which he learned in childhood shall be true for the solution of manhood's profoundest problems, that is, true so far as they go, though by no means sufficient for them; that the laws of evidence and the maxims of belief which he applies to the ordinary affairs of life, shall not need to be exchanged for others of a contrary nature and leading to totally different results before he can accept that Faith on which depends the salvation of his soul. He should, on the contrary, discover that the very principles which have carried him on in all that he knows of earthly things, shall carry him also, if applied in that direction when we come to the spiritual, into the belief of all that he needs to know for his soul's health, not indeed by his unassisted faculties. He should be able, by the processes of logical reasoning and scientific induction, to demonstrate that the Bible is the Word of God, that the Creed is the authorized summary of all essential doctrine, and that the Church is the perpetual witness of Eternal Truth.

If, now, we can secure this result, we gain at once the intellectual assent of all our young and rising minds to the Bible and the Church. If not, the whole tendency of our secular education, whether within or out of the Church, is to skepticism; and we leave the Preacher of the Gospel an immense task in the necessity for him to undo most of the work of the teacher, tear down what had been built up, in order that he may erect on the ruins an edifice of Christian Faith, where he should find, in the work of the instructor, a foundation already laid, and a heart and head expectant and waiting for the superstructure. And if this be not thus, whose is the fault? Only three reasons can be given: (1) either our Theology is wrong and inconsistent with the truth of nature and the methods of science, or (2) our Philosophy is wrong and

we in it lay down false principles and waken delusive expectations, or (3) there is an irreconcilable incompatibility between Science and Theology, between the Word of God as expressed in the works of Nature, and as written in Revelation. We suppose that nobody will avow the last of these opinions: *we* certainly shall not admit the first, and are therefore obliged to accept the second.

In saying that what passes under the name of Philosophy is at fault, we do not mean to say that it is all and altogether wrong. We do not suppose the Scripture can be proven from what is contained in the multiplication table or the rule of three. Nor can these require change. And so with the primary processes of observation, deduction, and reasoning upon the obvious facts of nature. And these may be all that is necessary for the lower forms of the life of intelligent beings. But if we would rise above that level at all we must have methods and processes for it. "And this method," says one, "is Revelation." We assent to his proposition, but still the question arises, "How and by what method and process are we to accept and apply Revelation?" Will the principles already learned in the lower sphere lead up to this, or must we abandon and contradict them, pour scorn and contempt upon all that has been called human reason, in order to accept this higher method, this means to an eternal life? And this is the very difficulty we are considering. The man who wishes to know how many days before Sunday, or how many apples he can buy for a sixpence at two for a penny, may have no need of mathematics: he can calculate all he wants to know by counting the ends of his fingers. But if he would know when the next eclipse of the moon occurs, or when a return of Encke's comet may be expected, he must look to his methods and the formulæ of computation. And precisely so if we are to accept a Revelation. We must, if we will act rationally, know that a Revelation has been made, and the knowledge of that fact implies the further knowledge of what a Revelation is, whether it is possible or not, how it can be made, and by what evidence attested. Thus we are hurried at once into the middle of metaphysical questions, in the very centre of the domain of Philosophy, and among its profoundest problems. We must look to the nature of human knowledge, and the means of its acquisition, and the limits within which it may range, and to what it is confined.

Nor are we without Scripture warrant for this exercise of our

faculties. The Sacred Writers constantly make use of it themselves, and require it on the part of their readers. To cite a single example, — our Saviour evidently regarded miracles as a proof of His divine power. The fact that He wrought them was not denied by those who witnessed them; but they differed from Him in regard to the Philosophy, the metaphysics, if one prefers the term, of Miracles. They could see in them no proof of Divine Mission; they thought that He cast out devils by Beelzebub, the Prince of Devils. And He reasoned with them: "Every kingdom divided against itself is brought to desolation, and every city or house divided against itself shall not stand; and if Satan cast out Satan he is divided against himself, how shall then his kingdom stand? And if I by Beelzebub cast out devils, by whom do your children cast them out? . . . But if I by the Spirit of God cast out devils, then the kingdom of God is come unto you." This is reasoning about miracles: it is the very quintessence of the Philosophy and Metaphysics. Our Lord does not deny that Satan can work what may be regarded by the beholder as a Miracle, but he does insist that there are true and divinely wrought Miracles, and that such Miracles do prove that the kingdom of God has come to those who behold them.

The earliest speculations of Philosophy raised the very questions that we have before us now, and upon which the faith or the infidelity of this age as of all ages depends: the means, the nature, and the extent of human knowledge. The Ionian School started without a doubt or a question as to the trustworthiness of sense-perception and the certainty of the knowledge we get by it. But they were perplexed about the metaphysical questions, "How came the external world into existence; is it eternal, self-existent; does it move of itself, or is there a Spiritual Being above and over all?" The Italian school, founded by Pythagoras, seem to have concluded that there was no doubt about the existence of an eternal Being; but how He had created the world, or whether the world were anything more than Himself divided and made visible, or, in fact, whether it really existed at all, none could say for a certainty. But when the disciples of the two Schools began to compare views, "the previous question" was at once raised. One class asked, "But how do we know that the material world exists? It is hardly worth while to ask whether it implies the existence of a God or not, until you have settled the question whether it be a

reality itself." Philosophers of the other class said, "But how do you know that God exists? It is hardly worth while to trouble ourselves to ascertain how He could create a world, or divide and 'individualize' Himself up into the objects we see around us, until we have settled the matter as to His existence." Each party was called upon for his solution of the problem of knowledge. "How do we know anything? Let us answer that, and in the answer we shall find the means of determining what we can know and how much concerning it."

Two theories were proposed then, and scarcely anything but modifications of them have been proposed since. The one class said, "By the senses, the eyes, the hands, the ears, etc., we perceive external objects. Through this means we know them and their properties: this is the beginning of knowledge, and its end, too; for we know nothing but what we see and observe. All else is mere conjecture and fancy. To talk of a soul is to transcend the bounds of knowledge; to speak of God and a Revelation is to talk of what no one can comprehend, and no sensible man will make trouble for himself."

But says Plato, "Then our case is sad indeed. We can have no science, no absolute truth. Look at any external object, and what do we know about it? It changes while we are looking at it. Do you say it is warm? perhaps the next time you touch it it will be cold, and your assertion will be found to be untrue. Do you say that your friend is well? perhaps he will be sick the next time you have the pleasure of meeting him. At this rate we cannot be sure of anything we say. Everything around us is changeable and fleeting, and no proposition concerning it can be uttered with any certainty that it will hold true longer than while we are telling it. 'There can be no science of the variable.' No. There must be eternal ideas, or paradigms of things, and whoever looks at them will see the truth — he will gain not mere 'opinion,' but absolute 'knowledge.' This must be so, for these ideas are the very essence of God Himself, — they are God; and just in so far as we partake of them and have them in our minds we are divine. Nay, the objects which we fancy we see in the external world are but the shadows which ideas cast into this cave of our earthly existence. The light is behind us, and we see the shadows on the walls before and around us, and foolishly take them for realities."

This sensational theory has been reaffirmed again and again from

Thales and the Ionian Philosophers to our day, by Aristotle, by Epicurus, by Bacon, by Locke, and by Sir William Hamilton, and always with the same result. What has been deducible from it as a logical inference has been produced as a historical development. The *disciples* have proceeded, sooner or later, to deny the reality of anything but objects of sense-perception — that is, the world of visible, tangible objects around us. They have denied the spirituality of the soul, the existence of God, and the certainty of a future life. They have held with Hume that while delusion, imposture, and priestcraft are possible and very common, miracles are impossible, and no amount of testimony can prove that a Revelation has been made or that a spiritual, personal, invisible God exists.

The ideal theory has been often modified. And it would be hardly worth while in this place to specify the modifications. Kant thought the mind furnished only the *forms*, the bare *schemata* of the ideas which we have of things. But this modification availed nothing. Fichte, Schelling, and Hegel denied the objective reality of external things none the less on account of it, and of course rendered any proof of a Revelation by Miracles as made to man through any medium or means, except his own mind and through his own faculties, to each individual impossible. Cousin proposed another modification, still believing that the sensational theory ends only in materialism and infidelity. He thought that certain regulative or preliminary ideas, as those of "space," of "time," of the "infinite," of "cause," of "substance," must be innate in order that sense-perception might be possible; and that on the reality of these ideas all our knowledge depends. But then, these ideas are the essence of the Divine Mind, "external realities independent of the human mind;" they are the voice of God within us, inspiration itself, and there can be no other inspiration or Revelation. We can have no knowledge or belief or faith except what is based upon these ideas; nay, our knowledge of the fact that there is a world around us, a soul within us, or a God above us, depends upon them.

And thus we have two theories: one holding that all knowledge comes from and depends upon sensation, with the inevitable consequence that therefore we can know nothing but the present, visible, material world — we can accept no Revelation, acknowledge and worship no God, and assent to as true nothing that we cannot un-

derstand and put into scientific formula : the other holding that all knowledge depends upon ideas already in the mind at its birth, and that we need no Revelation except the development of our own thoughts, and can be obliged to accept no rule, observance, or institution except as it commends itself to the Reason or voice of God within. And when pushed to extremes the one school now, as in days of old, deny the existence of God, and the other denies the existence of an external world. And as between these, Reid and the Scotch Philosophy, proposing really no theory of knowledge, attempting no solution of the difficulty, but in fact doing more towards a solution than all the others put together — suggest *Common Sense* instead of Philosophy. "All men," say they, "do believe in the reality of the external world, all well-meaning men do believe in the existence of God, and that His existence has been made manifest by Miracles and by Revelation 'at sundry times and in divers manners.'" And since that day sensible people have been very much inclined to believe in Common Sense and let Philosophy alone, leaving it to those who choose to pursue it, whether as an amusement or as a delusion.

But the difficulty remains, and lies deep erthan the range of mere Common Sense. The early notions of the Philosophers have become inwoven into all our science ; they constitute even the basis of our language. We could not get along now without the word "*idea*," whether we attach to it the meaning that Plato did or not. The words "substance," "essence," and more than all the personification, and perhaps we should say the "objectification," of mere abstractions into concrete realities in accordance with Platonism, form the basis of our natural sciences ; and in learning them we grow up with minds preoccupied by theories and trained to modes of thought which Nature neither requires nor sanctions, which however are most unfavorable to a hearty faith in the truths of revealed religion and the practice of the duties of the Christian faith. We talk of the "forces of nature" as producing the phenomena of nature ; of light, heat, electricity, etc., as certain demiurges who created and now control this lower world, as if we were the veriest Epicureans, and as though God had nothing to do with this world in which "we live, and move, and have our being."

Now, by all the strength of our faith in God, by all the earnestness of our zeal in the cause of human salvation, we say that this

need not be so, this should not be so : but man's advance in knowledge from his first lisping of the alphabet should be progression, each acquisition a step and a means to something higher, right on in an upward course, with no pause. The same processes and habits of thought, the same principles of knowledge that carried him all his way through the natural should carry him over the bridge that separates it from the supernatural, and should be his guide there as here to all that he needs to know and accept or can possibly understand ; and the principles of knowledge which we apply to the investigation of *facts of nature* should, and would if they were right, give us the very best and truest interpretation of the *Words of Revelation*.

Let us then proceed to consider some of the requisites to such a Philosophy, and perhaps we may in a subsequent Article speak of some of its applications, to show how its principles and methods will lead us to the results just spoken of — namely, the acceptance of the Bible as a Revelation from God, and the Creeds as the true interpretation of the Bible.

The first requisite to such a Philosophy is a recognition of what Physiology has taught us concerning the agency of the body and the bodily organs in the acts of intelligence. The knowledge in this department is indeed in its infancy. We know but little in comparison with what we may know and shall undoubtedly know hereafter. But we know enough now to require an entire reconstruction of our elementary treatises on Intellectual Philosophy. The Scotch Philosophers from Reid down to Abercrombie — himself a physician — have set the example, and turned their thoughts in this direction. But it is safe to say that more has been discovered in this department of Physiology — the Physiology of the nervous system — since the days of Abercrombie than all that was known by him or by anybody in his day. His work on "The Diseases of the Brain and Spinal Cord" was published in 1828. His treatise on "The Intellectual Powers of Man" in 1830. The wonderful discoveries in the anatomy and functions of the nervous system by Dr. Marshall Hall were not published to the world, even if they were made at that period. The discoveries of Dr. Hall were but the beginning of a series that has revolutionized or rather laid the foundation of knowledge in this department. We know now that there is no sense-perception without the activity of the nerves. That while sensation, properly speaking, is a purely

physical phenomenon, a mere effect of external objects on the nerves of sensation, perception is an act of the mind; and yet that in that act the ganglia in which the nerves of sense have their origin are certain agents, so that perception could no more take place without these ganglia than sensation could be produced without the nerves leading to them. And these new physiological discoveries have dispelled many of the old theories of perception and mental action. They do not indeed explain the mystery of the connection between the soul and the body, and the operations of the one upon the other; they promise no explanation of this mystery, but they have dispelled forever a whole host of fancies and conjectures, many of which had long passed for science.

Now no principle in the methods of investigation is better settled or more rational than that which requires that whenever we have two forms, or the effect of any two forces to consider, we must study the forces separately in order to find the law of their combined operation. But if, as in the case before us, one of the forces is so situated that we cannot study it directly, we must all the more carefully study the nature and influence of the other. The fact is now admitted and no longer is susceptible of a doubt, that in this life we know nothing of the operations of the intellect except as it acts through the agency of some portion of the nervous system. Hence we have no means of studying mental operations unmingled with an element of physical influence. But we can study the body by itself. We can experiment and observe upon animals below man, and even upon parts of the body removed from the brain and all connection with it. And we thus find that much which we had been accustomed to ascribe to the mind, and to regard as implying thought and reason, are purely physical phenomena implying neither mind nor will, nor in fact anything but a delicately organized physical structure. And meanwhile the remaining phenomena brought to our knowledge by consciousness, which no physical force can explain, make the fact, that within this curiously arranged physical structure which we call our body there is another agent of a totally different nature, and acting on entirely different principles, established more clearly if not more satisfactorily than was possible before.

Take for example a simple illustration. With an electrical machine properly arranged so as to give the shock to one's hand and arm, we produce a jerking motion in the limb, which is ob-

vious both to the consciousness of the patient, and to the eyes of the observer. In this case the phenomenon is purely physical, and may be produced as well upon the limb of a dead as of a living patient. But the living man can produce precisely the same jerking motion *by a force within* that is *voluntary*. But in the one it is produced by an outward physical cause, the electrical machine; in the other, it is produced by an inward cause, the mind. The machine, as we know, moreover acted only as it was acted upon: it produced its effect only as it was set in motion by some force acting upon it. But with regard to the inward force, — the mind, we know, as well as we know that it acted at all, that it acted spontaneously; and by a law, therefore, under which material objects never act: they are inert, but it is spontaneous.

Now here is an example of what we have said: the principles and methods which we adopt and act upon in the first and lower spheres of thought and investigation, must be the means that are to carry us up, or over, into a higher. The very methods by which we investigate the phenomena and laws of natural and material objects, if rightly understood, and rightly applied, advance us to a belief, and to some degree of knowledge, in regard to the things which are supernatural and spiritual. The methods of investigating material facts and forces bring us to the existence of the immaterial and supernatural. In closely and cautiously examining the functions of the body, we come across the soul as an ordinary agent, whose presence is as necessary as that of the body itself to explain the phenomena that are clearly seen to be real; the supernatural rests upon the natural; the foundation implies the superstructure, and the superstructure implies the foundation: the two make a completed and harmonious edifice, neither of which is complete or intelligible without the other.

It is indeed true that in this we rest upon a definition. We define matter as in itself inert. It is true that in later years there has been a pretense of denying this property of matter. "So far," says one, "from being inert, matter is in itself, force, the very *vis inertia*." We would simply ask these gentlemen what they mean by this? for they are teachers and professors of Philosophy, so-called *par excellence*, that is, of the metaphysics of nature and the natural sciences. Do they mean to deny, or doubt the first law of motion? Do they doubt, or deny that bodies at rest will remain so until they are put in motion by something out of

themselves, and being once in motion will continue so until they are stopped by some other body acting upon them? If aye, we ask them to be consistent with their belief, and act in all the affairs and transactions of life as nobody else does; act like fools and madmen, until the stern realities of nature knock the conceit out of them, or themselves out of the world. If no, then they admit all we ask, and we do not care to pause and quarrel about words. They may call it what they please, and we will accommodate them by accepting their name for it. But we mean, and they mean that property of matter by which we can assert the first, and so all the laws of motion, and without which we can have no natural science, no practical operations with nature.

We pass to another question. How does man come to know that matter is inert? By the eye he can perceive its color, by his hand its solidity; but how does he know its inertia? By the eye and by the hand he can see as a fact that it does not move, or keeps on moving, as the case may be. But when he calls it inert, he asserts something more than these perceived facts. He asserts that it *will* not, *because* it *cannot* change its condition as from rest to motion, and from motion to rest, without an agency from out of itself. This absolute affirmation, this "*cannot*," how and whence comes that?

Now right here we are at the old difficulty, the "previous question" of all knowledge. If we have only sense-perception, we could make no such assertion. Hence, manifestly there is something more. Is it an "idea?" Is it a mere "regulative law of the mind?" Is it a "form," a "schema?" Is it a "logical antecedent?" If any, or all of these, how do we know that what we thus assert on purely subjective grounds (for they are all subjective and nothing else) will hold true of objective realities? How do we know that the truth of what we assert, or rather our confidence in it, does not depend upon the nature of the admitting mind, rather than upon that of the admitted truth? We must conclude, therefore, as philosophers have done, and as the historic developments of philosophic systems have proved, that ideas alone, in any possible variation of the ideal theory, are no ground for the affirmation of objective truth, no means of knowledge of the objects in the external world; that with these alone for a foundation, we could have no natural science.

Will then, the two combined, sensations and ideas, the one

produced by external objects, and the other furnished by the mind itself, answer any better purpose? We do not know that the effort has ever really been made to see. The incompatibility of the two theories is so great, and so obvious, that no attempt that we are aware of has ever been made to combine them. Nor is it likely to be made by any one who understands either system well enough to make any application of it. The fact is, the assertion requires something more and besides all that either system, the sensational or the ideal, can give. Inertia cannot be seen; therefore, sensationalism can say nothing about it, could not even have a term to denote it, any more than a community of blind persons could have terms to denote colors. Inertia is a property of external material objects; therefore, although ideas might enable us to think of it, invent a term for it, and declare it possible as a property of objects, they could never enable us to predicate it of any real object, to say of any concrete thing, it is inert.

We have often read with great interest and admiration for the skill of the critic, Cousin's "Review of Locke's Essay on the Human Understanding." But there is one point in it in which it has always seemed to us that the reviewer cut with a two-edged sword, and equally both ways. These two great champions of the two rival systems of Philosophy, sensationalism and idealism, the two greatest champions that the world ever has seen, or is likely to see, differ of course in their account of "the origin of the idea of cause." Mr. Cousin argues with irresistible force that if we had sense-perception only as a means of knowledge, we should have no idea of cause, no such word in any language, and that all that we could see, and all that we can now mean by "causality," is mere antecedence, the going before in the order of time and of motion; therefore, argues Mr. Cousin, there must be in the mind some innate idea of cause. But Mr. Cousin does not turn round to see what a blow he has struck behind him, and right into the very heart of his own system. He does not see that if we speak of one object or event as being the cause of another, only because we have "the idea of cause" within the mind determining our judgment, we could see only causality, and should and could know no difference between it and mere antecedence. If Locke be right, we should know nothing of causality as anything more than mere antecedence; if Cousin be right, we should know nothing of mere antecedence as anything less than causality. "Of

contradictories, both cannot be right; of contraries, both may be wrong." And so it is here.

It is manifest, we think, that man has over and above sense-perception, and besides all "the ideas," innate or otherwise, which he may possess, an insight into the nature of the things he beholds or contemplates. By this he sees that matter is in its very nature inert; that in some cases, the antecedent exerts an influence in producing that which follows, that it does not in others; and hence, he is capable of science, capable of making absolute affirmations, capable of reasoning from the seen to the unseen, of rising from nature up to the supernatural, from the knowledge of the created to the knowledge of God the Creator, from science to Revelation.

Let us make this plain by an example more simple than any we have yet given. We say that "a straight line is the shortest, between two points." Now grant that we can see the line and that it is straight, how do we know that it is the shortest? This "*shortestness*" we cannot see. Does one say we obtain it by measurement? He must consider that measurement would be only an approximation. No means that man can devise, or use, could measure the millionth part of an inch for example. And we assert in our proposition, not an "approximation," but an absolute, unqualified, unlimited truth. But more than this; we are perfectly aware that as a matter of fact we do not resort to any process of measurement, in order to be sure of the truth of what we assert in the case. We assert it *as following from the very nature of a straight line*; it would not be straight if it were not the shortest.

Now call this what you please, and explain its *modus operandi* as you please, it is manifest that we have somehow an insight into the nature of a straight line.

Or take, if the reader desires it, one more example. We say that "it is impossible for two straight lines to inclose a space." In this assertion we transcend the possibility of perception, and even of imagination. We can perceive (we may admit) straight lines of a certain length; we can imagine them a great deal longer than the reach of our vision. But lines of an *infinite* length we cannot even imagine. Hence we cannot tell, either by sight, or by imagination, what they may do in that region beyond which imagination ceases to be able to follow them. We assert our prop-

osition, therefore, on the ground of an insight into the nature of straight lines. We know that if they are straight, they can cross each other at most only once, and hence they can effect no inclosure how far soever they may extend. And by this word "*insight*" in this connection, we mean something different from what the Greek and Roman philosophers ever thought of, something different from what the Germans mean by their "*auschonung*," usually translated "*intuition*." They all, Greek, Roman, and German, alike meant, as their terms literally translated signify, an *on-sight*, and not an *in-sight*. With the Germans, sense-perception is an "*auschonung*," an intuition or *onsight*; for when we see an object we look at or upon it. And so, too, in imagination, when we do not indeed see an object, we "*see how it looks*," the act is an "*auschonung*," an *onsight*, a looking at it and contemplating it as real, and as if it were before the eyes. Hence, the German *auschonung* can give us no more knowledge of objects than mere sense-perception; it can help us to no assertions, which we could not have made from the mere perception of the object without any such act, which is, in fact, only an act of imagination.

All this may be only Common Sense in the higher exercises of it. And if so, let us have Common Sense hereafter, and no more Philosophy. And there is reason for calling it Common Sense. It is essential to raise man above the brute, above the mere idiot. Without it, he may have the senses all complete, their action perfect and unimpaired. But without some capacity to *see into* things as well as to see them, man could have no science; he could not even have that share of understanding which enables him to kindle a fire — a thing which not one of the animals in the species below man has ever been able to do. Without some measure of this insight, some insight of what others intend and design to do, he could by no means coöperate with them and help them; he would not know enough to enable him to keep out of their way.

In conclusion of our Article, let us make one more application. By "*insight*" into nature man knows that it is not self-existent and self-moved. By a like exercise of his faculties he knows that he did not create and does not now sustain it; and, moreover, that no being or number of beings like himself, in the limitation of their capacities and powers, did create, or could now sustain it, and keep it moving. The only rational inference, therefore, would be that there is *One Being* who did create it, and who now

sustains it, and keeps it moving by His wisdom and power. We might call Him infinite and absolute or not, just according to the meaning, or no-meaning that we attach to those words. What we should *know* would be that He IS, that He possesses and exercises the wisdom, and the power, and the goodness which those works of His hand imply. And from this conception of Him and His attributes we should expect, as in the highest degree probable, that while His nature and attributes and the mode of His being are incomprehensible to us, He would nevertheless make such a Revelation of Himself and His will concerning us as we might need for all the purposes of holiness, happiness, and eternal life. And we should certainly expect that He would attest this Revelation, when He might make it, by miracles.

All this, you will say, is but Common Sense. Of course it is. But it is the very best and highest kind of Philosophy nevertheless. It is *metaphysics* in the truest and purest sense. It is transcendentalism if you please, and the only kind that is anything more than the freak of an idle and wayward fancy, wandering from the domain of reality and the universe of facts, as God has made them and man has seen them, into a region of man's creation, where he encounters the obscurity, the inconsistencies, the "antinomies," and the insoluble problems which always attend upon incompetency and imperfection.

But in order to escape these obvious conclusions of Common Sense, Philosophy has several expedients. We have spoken of two, that of the idealists and that of the sensationalists. We will notice one or two more.

It is said that for aught we know, or can infer from an observation of nature, its objects and these phenomena of motion and change may have been going on forever, and so imply no creation and superintending providence.

We answer (resting on the same "*insight*," or Common Sense) that everything in nature exists in the form of series; thus, for example, *in nature* every oak comes from an acorn, and inversely every acorn comes from an oak. But it is Common Sense and mathematics too, that every existing series must have a first term, and that no series can generate its own first term. Now nothing in physical science is more certain than that there was a time when there was neither oak nor acorn in this world of ours. Which was first? and how came the first term in this series of re-

production? Whichever may have been first, that first term had a cause and an origin out of and above the series.

It may indeed sometimes happen that a term in one series is generated by another series, and so on backwards infinitely. As for example, a comet coming with one planetary system in a parabolic orbit might be so influenced at a certain point, as to move thenceforth in an elliptical orbit around our sun. In the first case the successive stages would be a series of terms making up a parabola; after the change the consecutive differentials would constitute an ellipse. But in this case the change, the origin of the first term in the second series, did not grow out of the preceding; it was caused by an influence foreign to it, which acted once, and could act but once only (in that particular way at least) as an occasional cause. If now man, for example, sprang once, and in one instance only, from some of the lower orders according to the Lamorkion and Darwinian theories, yet the production of the first man, the origin of the first term in this series, is no less a proof of the existence and activity of some Being above all series. Thus it would be if there had been no previously existing series of reproduction in the order of monkeys, or whatever other species of animals may be preferred as man's immediate progenitors. In either case the origin of a protoplasmic pair in any series implies a Creator, and that Creator must be above and out of all series, and not a term in any. For the reasons just given, He must, therefore, be eternal in the only sense which we can attach to that word. He must be personal, for the first act must have proceeded from Himself alone without any concurrence of exciting or occasional causes, since there was, by the very supposition, nothing in existence but Himself, and therefore nothing to act as such a cause.

Another expedient which "philosophy falsely so-called" has devised to get rid of the inference that is thus drawn, is to refer to the "forces of nature," light, heat, electricity, converting them into gods, the real demiurges of our modern polytheistic naturalism. Of these agencies in themselves we *know* nothing. We do not even know that they are agents. We see an object becoming warm by the influence of another, and we talk of heat. We see an object becoming visible by means of another which we call luminous, and we talk of light. We see another object exhibiting a peculiar excitement, and we talk of electricity and galvanism, as

if we knew something of these agents as being more than mere modes in which these invisible objects seem obviously to act upon and influence others. It is a pure and mere act of fancy by which we create them into forces — “the forces of nature,” — an act, moreover, which Common Sense, and the insight of a higher Philosophy — to say nothing of the recent investigations in the purely physical sciences as exhibited by such men as Mayher and Tindall — show to be absurd, and which would be ridiculous, if it were not so mischievous in its consequences. Accept, then, this correction of our fancy, and the assertion that the “forces of nature” are in themselves adequate to the production of these phenomena of change and growth, and the doctrine comes to be something like this: certain elements, as oxygen, hydrogen, carbon, and nitrogen, with others, after having remained for an eternal period inactive, aroused themselves from the past inactivity, and combined themselves into an acorn or an egg, and then by a continuance of the like activity in another form, and under other circumstances, they developed the acorn and the egg into a mature individual, capable of reproduction, and thus the series began, which has been prolonged to this day. And in this form no man of Common Sense will accept the theory. But even if he should, he is making oxygen and hydrogen his gods, making them eternal, and ascribing to them acts of personality, intelligence, wisdom, and power. He is asserting that they did once what they have never done since, and what no preceding occasion or cause could have induced them to do, since by the supposition there was no such occasion or cause. But even so, we are better off than when we talk of heat, light, etc., as “forces” and “causes” in nature, for oxygen, carbon, etc., are real substantial things; whereas, heat, light, etc., are but objectified abstractions, the mere creation of the human fancy.

We have gone far enough, however, for the present. We will merely add, that we think that this course of remark will satisfy all; that when we have a Philosophy, a metaphysics based upon the facts of nature and the “insight” of the Common Sense of men, we shall have one that so far from being the parent of error, the cause of unbelief and misbelief in matters of Religion, will prove a handmaid of Religion; will lead men up from the natural to the supernatural, from the study of the phenomena of the material world to a belief in the Father of spirits, and from the pur-

suit of things here below to the attainment through Jesus Christ and the Revelation of God's will, of Life Eternal.

ART. III. — JEESEH, THE GREAT PYRAMID: ITS AGE, DESIGN,¹ AND ORIGIN.

THE past is a dead thing leading through a valley of dry bones. Largely of antiquarian interest, we find it difficult to excite inquiry about its buried generations. This may be affirmed of the past in general. And yet there are periods that never expire. Perennial in being, the same yesterday and forever. One illustration of this is found in that union of the present and the past exhibited in the structure of the Great Pyramid.

The age of Jeesch is our own age. And here we indulge in no metaphor or hyperbole. The proposition is not presented as something only poetically true; for when we come to understand the age of the Great Pyramid, the declaration may appear in the main as a sober fact, and we shall feel persuaded that that age was full of our thought, and throbbing with many of the practical issues of modern life. It may also appear, that in history there are no asymptotes, and that the widest extremes never trend so far away but that they finally meet.

It is indeed difficult to realize that the present has any substantial connection with that dim past of which we speak. When Egypt is the theme, History waves her magic wand, and in a moment the centuries roll back, leaving us upon the banks of the Nile in the days of the Pharaohs. The land, far and wide, is strewn with cities, towns, and villages, and teeming with a busy population. The streets are alive with trade; the placid Nile, born of the Mountains of the Moon, is flecked with light rush-built boats; and on every hand is seen the magnificent temple, the stately palace, the hallowed shrine, and the venerated sphinx; while beyond, along the border of the desert, the eternal pyramids heave upward their tremendous bulk, and with their summits pierce the sky. Yet in the midst of all is the grinding oppression

¹ This article is based chiefly on Professor Piazza Smith's works, "Our Inheritance in the Great Pyramid," and "Life and Work at the Great Pyramid;" together with John Taylor's book, "The Great Pyramid; why it was built."

and the fell superstition that crushed the children of Israel. Isis and Osiris are there. The priests crowd their altars, and the symbols of idolatry blaze on every sacrificial vase, and glow on every porch, architrave, door-post, and wall. Superstition rules the popular art, and lays all science under heavy contribution. It sways every institution, it colors every law. It shapes and saturates every opinion, it rules in every household, and plants its despotism in every heart.

But remember that *this was not properly the age of the Great Pyramid.*

Is this structure, then, older than the Egyptian religion? To this we must give an emphatic *no*. At the time the Great Pyramid was erected the Egyptians were a numerous people, and had largely developed their religious system. The pyramid was even built by Egyptian labor, as the quarry marks prove. Yet the labor was performed under compulsion, the Egyptians themselves being held in subjection by some superior mind. This is evident from such authorities as Manetho and Herodotus, who tell us that the Egyptians hated the power that they obeyed, and which was an abomination unto the Egyptians. By this power they were forced to build with reference to a certain plan, which effectually excluded every taint of idolatry and superstition. Thus the Great Pyramid, while *in*, is not *of* Egypt. It belongs to another land and another age than that in which it was built.

These declarations may appear novel to some, and especially to those who have hitherto regarded the Great Pyramid as a creation of the idolatrous Egyptian mind, designed for the tomb of that particular Pharaoh whose counterfeit presentment is treasured in the Abbot Collection of the New York Historical Society, and whose body was consigned by the hand of the Almighty to the depths of the Red Sea. Dean Stanley only expresses the common notion in regard to the character of Jeeseh, when, in an outburst of poetic enthusiasm, he speaks of the Sphinx — an impure creation of another age that fairly reeks with sensuous superstition — *as the appropriate guardian of the Great Pyramid.* But this is a structure whose perfect surface of blameless stone discards every thought of idolatry and sin. With equal reason might one present a Fejee fetish as an appropriate guardian of the heavenly gates.

But the time has now come for scholars to reëxamine, if not discard, puerile views drawn from their primers. The land of

Egypt is fast yielding up its secrets, and the once sealed book of hieroglyphics is now read with the facility of a modern tongue. Every rock, temple, and tomb is speaking to the world with something more than a Memnonian power, while the hoary pyramid itself becomes eloquent, addressing the reverent antiquarian on lofty themes.

The attempt has, therefore, been made in this Article to collect a few of the principal thoughts, facts, and arguments adduced by the late John Taylor and Professor Piazzi Smith in their respective works on the Great Pyramid, — works that are distinguished by unusual ability and much learning, and which will, doubtless, receive, at no distant period, that high recognition in the scientific world that they so richly deserve. We do not, however, intend to present all of these views as absolutely true. We have much yet to learn on the whole subject. Nevertheless, it is clear that the time has come at least to suspect the truth of the old sarcophagus theory; while every friend of progress must feel interested in learning something of those new views which are now being gradually worked out.

The first point to be considered is the Age of the Great Pyramid. This, however, involves some allusion to the notice which the structure has gained in the works of early writers.

Jeeseh, the Great Pyramid, has, in all ages, been distinguished above its fellows now standing in view of ancient Memphis, not far from the present city of Cairo. Its superiority appears in the magnitude of its proportions, in its wondrous internal structure, and its exquisite finish. Herodotus, Strabo, and Pliny speak of it, though there is a question whether either of them ever stood within its walls. But that the Romans entered one of its chambers there can be no doubt. This point was set at rest by Caviglia, who rediscovered it in 1820, and found the roof still bearing Roman letters.

In after ages the knowledge of the entrance was lost, and the pyramid was assailed by driving hills of sand. When, in the year A. D. 820, the Caliph Al Mamoun wished to enter, he was obliged to take tradition for his guide, and thus grope in the dark for the passage on the northern face which received the Romans. To this point he directed the workmen, saying, "Open that wonderful pyramid!" They replied that "it could not be done." But here the will of the despot was imperious; and then came drill,

bar, sledge, fire, and vinegar. A natural desire to have his own way operated powerfully upon the mind of the Caliph, but his self-will had been reinforced by the court poets, who fired his mind with visions of great wealth stored up within this mountain of stone. All the treasures of "Sheddad Ben Ad," the great antediluvian king of the earth, were there. Besides this, "Ibn Abd Alkakhm" told how King Surid made in the pyramid "divers celestial spheres and stars, and what they severally operate in their aspects; and the perfumes which are to be made to them, and the books which treat of these matters." He had also placed in the pyramid "an idol of black agate, his eyes open and shining, sitting on a throne, with a lance; and when any looked upon him, he heard on one side of him a voice which took away his sense, so that he fell prostrate upon his face, and ceased not till he died." This feature of the case was certainly not quite so inviting; yet within the pyramid, beyond the idol, was the image of a cock, made of precious stones, whose eyes enlightened all the place; and then there was a large hall, where a quantity of golden coins were put up in columns, every piece of which was the weight of a thousand dinars.

This was sufficient, notwithstanding all the terrors; and so the Arabs plied their work, night and day.

But after penetrating a hundred feet without finding a passage they began to murmur and rebel. Just then they heard a stone fall, indicating a hollow passage within a short distance. With fresh zeal they applied themselves once more to the work, and ere long stumbled into the identical passage by which the Greek, the Persian, and the Egyptian went down on his way to the interior. This passage was "exceeding dark, dreadful to look at, and difficult to pass." They nevertheless entered where no foot had trodden for ages and moved on until they came to a huge portcullis of stone barring the way. Around this they dug a passage, regained the course, and rushed onward, forgetting altogether that terrible image with the lance, and thinking only of gold. Finally all the approaches were passed, and they entered a noble chamber with exquisitely finished walls; and now for the treasure! But instead of treasure they found only an empty stone chest without a lid.

The caliph's heart was crushed with disappointment; still he was a man of inventive genius, and, to keep his credit (says an enemy), he had a large sum of gold buried in a certain place at

night, and the next morning it was duly dug up by his admiring and satisfied friends, while the empty chest was forgotten.

Since that day the interior of Jeeseh has always been open; yet, notwithstanding the frequency of the explorations, no inscription has yet been discovered that fixes the precise date of its erection. There has consequently been much speculation on the subject, and unusual methods have been tried to determine this interesting point.

The year A. D. 1817, the date of 1800 B. C. was frequently assigned to the pyramid; but thirty years ago Sir Gardner Wilkinson set back the period to between 2083 B. C. and 2123 B. C., and in 1858 he set it back again to 2400 B. C. Even in this he resisted Baron Bunsen, who fixed the date with great confidence at 3280 B. C., while Lepsius inclined to 3500 B. C. Later, Mariette Bey and Renan insist on 4500 B. C., and Hekekyan Bey goes back even to 4863. All these dates have been fixed by the aid of what the writers in question call "the monuments."

Others have sought to settle the question by an appeal to Astronomy. Sir John Herschel, assuming that the entrance passage at the pyramid was designed at its erection to give a view of the *then* polar star, made a calculation to ascertain what star was the polar star at the time of the erection, as given by the literary, or monumental data. For this purpose he took four thousand years back from 1839 A. D. and computed for 2161 B. C. The only star at that period fit to be a polar star was *a Draconis*. He accordingly concluded that this was the actual pole star when the pyramid was built, and, accordingly, fixed upon the date 2161 B. C.

Most men now considered the age of the pyramid as fixed; but soon the Germans ran the literary date up to 3500 B. C., and *a Draconis* went out, for the time, in the darkness.

Next Mahmoud Bey, the Egyptian astronomer, appeared on the scene with his *Siriadic* theory, and endeavored to demonstrate that at the time the pyramid was built its south face looked towards the star Sirius, the Egyptian god of the dead, whose hieroglyph was a triangle or pyramid, a star, and a crescent. He accordingly fixed the date at 3303 B. C.

This led Professor Smith to inquire whether the pyramid had any astronomical reference at all. In doing so he first examined the *Siriadic* theory, objecting to it on the ground that there is nothing in the south face of the pyramid to show a reference to

Sirius or any other star, and that the angle of the face does not suit for Sirius; while the literary date upon which Mahmoud Bey had relied to agree with his own, as fixed by Sirius, has been taken from under his feet by Mariette Bey and Renan.

The *a Draconis* theory of Herschel constituted a noble advance in pyramid investigation, yet it did not go far enough; and, therefore, it became necessary to appeal to the pyramid itself once more. In doing this, Professor Smith thinks that he found testimony proving that the pyramid had a genuine astronomical meaning, though the *a Draconis* reference was a subordinate one. The *chief* reference was found to refer to the Pleiades, that exquisite group of stars which has excited the admiration of man and engaged his studious thought in every age.

It is true that Herschel's discovery of the astronomical use of the entrance passage of the pyramid has been set down by a writer in the "*Encyclopædia Britannica*" as no discovery, the writer in question affirming that this passage was designed to be stopped up, like pyramids intended for the purposes of entombment. But, granting even that the passage *was* thus designed to be closed, the concession does not injure the astronomical theory; for it is not claimed that the pyramid was intended for every-day use.

Here we may well quote the sage remarks of Lord Valentia, written nearly sixty years ago, who asks:—

"If in the opinion of all Egyptologists the pyramids had been built solely to preserve the sarcophagi of buried monarchs safely, why did not the builders pull out all the fine white lining from the passages, and build up the long holds with ordinary masonry, like the rest of the mass; for then half the mountain-like building, or more, would have had to be pulled down before the concealed central room would or could have been discovered; whereas now, with the fine and polished lining left in, whether the passage itself be internally stopped up or not, the line of it is clearly distinguishable, and conducts a depredator at once and inevitably to the very chamber where, on the burial hypothesis, he ought not to go?"

The answer to this sensible query is now ready. The builders did *not* seek to make the place forever inviolate, but rather to preserve in the interior the symbols of certain great truths for future reference. Therefore, while temporarily barring the way to the King's Chamber, they left the lines of exquisitely polished rock as an infallible guide for those who might come in after times.

There is nothing, therefore, in the objection given to prevent us from accepting an astronomical use for the pyramid passage, as wrought out roughly by Herschel, and perfected by Smith. As the result of the latter's calculations, it is found that the entrance passage pointed directly to the Pleiades 2200 years B. C., when that constellation was exactly on the meridian. This is proved by a mass of evidence covering many pages.

It is true that the great name of Baron Bunsen was arrayed against the views of Herschel and Smith. Let us, therefore, hear what he says: "The groundlessness of the fancies which have been again very recently indulged in about the astronomical uses of the pyramids, and about a hidden symbolical system of astronomy, is demonstrated by that thorough conviction which is forced upon us by a view of the monuments and the reading of the hieroglyphics." All, however, that Bunsen knows about the monuments and hieroglyphics is taken at second hand; and, accordingly, in treating this subject he falls into twenty notable errors in the course of ten pages.

What, then, *is* the monumental or hieroglyphic date of the pyramid? For this we are chiefly indebted to the labors of Colonel Howard Vyse, whose excavations in the pyramid, over the King's Chamber, brought to light certain quarry marks, which give the names of the builders, King Suphis, or Shofu, and his brother Knemu. Thus the pyramid itself now cries out against Baron Bunsen, who, relying on what he calls "the monuments," assigned this great work to King Shafre, or Chephrenes, of another period. And taking Osborn's invaluable work on the monumental inscriptions of Egypt, what do we find to be the period assigned to the real builders? This is nothing less than the period when the Pleiades were seen just on the meridian from the entrance passage of the pyramid, that is just about 2200 years B. C. Osborn *read* hieroglyphics, while Bunsen did *not*. Which, therefore, was the more likely to be right? Thus far we are now able to go on the question of its age.

We now come to treat of the design of Jeeseh, or the Great Pyramid.

From the time of Herodotus to the present day it has been the custom of most writers in Western Europe to speak of the Great Pyramid, and of *all* the pyramids, as tombs of kings or individuals of a royal race. Yet there have, nevertheless, always been a few

who entertained more extensive views, and during the last two centuries the Great Pyramid has been considered by them as signifying nothing less than a grand system of weights and measures.

The first traces of this idea are found in the works of Bishop Cumberland of the See of Peterborough, A. D. 1865, who, however, assumed no more than that the several parts of the Great Pyramid were regulated in size according to convenient even numbers of local standards of measure then existing. He was followed by an anonymous but able writer, who advanced boldly to the position that this stupendous structure was designed to indicate to the various families of the earth for all time a complete system of weights and measures, without any reference to what existed in Egypt.

The metrological purpose was also maintained in France by M. Paucton, in 1780, and by M. Romé de l'Isle, in 1789. The French philosophers in Egypt, 1799, thought much on the subject; and in 1806 the Rev. Thomas Gabb published his "*Finis Pyramidis*."

The subject, however, was finally taken up by the late John Taylor, who devoted nearly a quarter of a century to its unremitting study. He has been followed by Professor Piazzi Smith, who gave us at first a single volume, which is now supported by three more. This last work corrects quite a number of mistakes, both of his own and of John Taylor's, and conveys his mature convictions, founded on observations and measurements obtained by him during his recent prolonged residence at the pyramids, where he was encouraged in his investigations by the Viceroy of Egypt.

What, then, according to our best knowledge, does the Great Pyramid signify?

Says the Rev. John Forbes, "In God's work of creation, amidst the rich profusion and diversity which seem at first to defy all attempts at arrangement and classification, an unexpected beauty of order and regularity are discoverable on closer examination, and all things, from the lowest to the highest, are found 'to be ordered in measure and number and weight.'" And when we approach the Great Pyramid we find that the universal law, written all over the visible creation, is here treated with respect; so this vast structure appears neither as a treasure-house nor a tomb; but on the contrary it lifts itself up from afar as a scientific treatise in stone, designed to regulate for all time great practical questions between man and man.

The first point to which attention must be called is the orientation of the pyramid. This is indeed not exactly perfect, the variation being $4' 35''$. This, however, is less than the variation which exists in one of the most celebrated European observatories.

The first pyramid measures of the French *savans* were less correct than the recent calculations, and showed a supposed variation of $19' 58''$, yet they were delighted even by *that* result. Much more is the final measurement calculated to excite our admiration of the builder's scientific exactness.

As a preliminary, we must also notice the geographical position of the pyramid, which is nearly in latitude 30° . M. Nouet set it down as $29^\circ 59' 6''$, but Professor Smith's, using Playfair's altitude-azimuth instrument, is $29^\circ 58' 51''$, which cannot be more than $3''$ out of the way. But why, it may be asked, did not the builder place it exactly on 30° ? Professor Smith well says in reply, that it "would have taken the building off its noble hill and buried it ingloriously in a broad bay of sand, which intervenes to the north." This all indicates the high scientific mind which directed the location of the work.

Being assured of the orientation and geographical position of the Pyramid, let us now view the structure itself. The base is a square, and its four sides incline towards its central vertical axis at equal angles. Measuring the base line it is found, as near as the calculation would come, that it contains 9,142 British inches. Here is where John Taylor and Professor Smith both begin to discover standards of length. Sir Isaac Newton having shown that the cubit of the Jews, which they possessed before the descent into Egypt, and which Moses took care to have used only for sacred purposes, was close on 25 inches in length, Mr. Taylor proceeds to show that such a cubit is most astonishingly earth-commensurable, being one-ten-millionth of the semi-axis of rotation of the earth. On the other hand, the French metrical system was based on the *metre*, which was assumed to be one-ten-millionth of a quadrant of a particular meridian of the earth. Yet this system is inferior to the former, which employs "a straight line coming from the centre to the surface, along the governing axis of the world." And the sacred cubit of the descendants of Abraham was a remarkably even fraction of this line, as well as being every way adapted to common use. Now it is believed by Professor Smith that the men who planned the Great Pyramid (for it is of this alone that our

Article treats) employed this cubit intentionally instead of the profane cubit of 20.7 inches, and knew perfectly its grand relations to the globe whose annual revolutions were registered in the base line of the pyramid by a number of cubits corresponding to the number of days in the year.

With measures of length come those of *weight* and *capacity*, all of which are supposed to be treated of in the pyramid. Mr. Taylor therefore finds that the so-called porphyry coffer in the King's Chamber of the pyramid was intended to serve, with its hollow cubical space, or contents, as a standard measure of *capacity* and *weight*. This was the view of the Rev. Thomas Gabb in 1806, who says that the French *savans* in 1799 "give it as their belief that the excavation of this granite chest was originally intended by the founders of the pyramid, not for the repository of the sarcophagus of a corpse, as has been the prevalent but truly ridiculous opinion, but for a standard measure of capacity."

Mr. Taylor has led all others by successfully identifying the cubic contents of the coffer not only with the ancient Hebrew capacity measures but with the Anglo-Saxon also. And this leads us to consider here the meaning of the word *pyramid*.

It has been customary to derive this word from $\pi\upsilon\rho$, *fire*, so that the edifice might be classed among the creations of fire-worshippers. but Mr. Taylor derives it from $\pi\rho\omega\varsigma$, *wheat*, and $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\tau\rho\nu$, *measure*. It has also been derived from $\pi\rho\omega\varsigma$ and $\acute{\alpha}\mu\acute{\alpha}\omega$, to *collect*. And if he is correct, the name accords well with his definition of its use.

That the coffer was afterwards used for another purpose there can be but little doubt, as *imperfect* grooves for a lid are seen, and a place on one side for fastening pins, as is usual in the sarcophagus; though the sculptured ornaments always found on a burial coffer are wholly wanting, which indicates that it was not originally designed to receive a human body. This coffer was *built into the pyramid*, and cannot now be removed. It was evidently the chief thing in the mind of the builder, the very thing that this mountainous structure was designed to preserve; and if the coffer had been intended to receive a human body it would have been finished in the highest perfection, and with grooves that would at least have made the lid secure. If used, therefore, at all as a sarcophagus, this idea was an *after-thought*, one that never entered the mind of the designer. Every reasonable person should therefore be careful in charging such clumsiness upon the builder as the sarcophagus theory supposes.

But the main discussion relates to the actual capacity of the coffer, concerning which in times past there has been no little difference of opinion. To settle this, among many other points, Professor Smith spent several months at the pyramid in the year 1865.

Professor Smith inquires whether or not the cubical contents of the coffer correspond with a certain exact quantity derivable from the theory of the pyramid when applied to the earth as known to modern science. He says: "This theory is, that a cubic space is to be formed with sides having a length equal to the one-ten-millionth of the earth's axis of rotation, or 50 pyramid inches. A tenth of such space, or 12,500 cubic inches (agreeably with the Coptic interpretation of the name of pyramid) is then to be filled with matter of the *mean density* or specific gravity of the earth as a whole. In which case such a mass will form the grand weight standard of the pyramid, while the space occupied by an equal weight of pure water at a given temperature, will form the grand *capacity* standard of the Great Pyramid, or, as we believe, will represent and be represented by, the cubic contents of the hollow of the coffer." This is the point to be tested by actual measurements and calculations. Much depends, likewise, on the precise value of the earth's mean density, as compared with water; while the idea of introducing the weight of the globe, instead of using one of its elements—water—is a novelty among all systems of metrology. The principle is nevertheless just. The numerical value of the earth's mean density, as now determined, may be taken as 5.70; *i. e.* 5.70 times as heavy as an equal bulk of distilled water at a temperature of 68° Fahrenheit. Therefore, on the previously announced principles, 12,500 cubic inches multiplied by 5.70, or 71,250 cubic pyramid inches, ought to form the internal bulk of the grand standard of measure for the pyramid. What, then, is the measure of the coffer? As nearly as it could be determined, the length, breadth, and depth are in British inches 77.93, 26.73, 34.34; or, in pyramid inches 77.85, 26.70, 34.31. These multiplied give 71,317, or, too much to meet the exact requirements of the case by less than 1-1000th, which, practically, is a very near approach. "Our proof then," says Professor Smith, "*that the coffer is the right vessel originally intended for a weight and capacity standard*, depends upon its measured contents coming out close to what was expected by a certain theory, closely based upon the previously proved linear

standard. But seeing that that theory must also be partly founded on, or rather tested by, modern determinations of the earth's mean density, which determinations are by no means very close or accurate, the proof may be regarded as not an absolutely certain one."

Still, however, he tells us that there is additional testimony that goes to prove that the coffer is in its original position, where it was placed for metrical use.

Over the door-way of entrance to the King's Chamber is a remarkable symbol consisting of four engraved equidistant lines or grooves, so arranged as to divide the wall into five equal strips, illustrating the principle of a division into five. The utmost ingenuity of the Egyptian antiquarians has heretofore failed to assign them a proper use. "Hence," says Professor Smith, "all that we can declare as a fact is, that near the interior of a building whose ancient name, it is said, was 'a division into ten,' there is one wall typifying, or rather positively illustrating 'a division of five.'" This symbol is the last object seen when the visitor stoops to enter the King's Chamber where the coffer is still preserved.

And this coffer, according to the metrological theory, is founded, in part, on the one-ten-millionth of the earth's axis of rotation; or, fifty inches. The symbol over the door-way is therefore apparently connected with the coffer, according to "a division of ten."

But, looking around the chamber, it is found that "a division of five" is there; for the four walls of the room each have four horizontal joint lines dividing their surfaces into five horizontal strips. Therefore, Professor Smith suggests as a designation "the chamber of five," or "the chamber of the standard of fifty." And is not this, he asks, the reason why the builder was at the enormous labor and expense required to trim these vast granite blocks to a uniform size, for, unless some unusual object were in view, he would never have been guilty of what would otherwise appear as a piece of egregious folly.

And in forming an estimate of the value of these deductions we must observe that the liberty taken cannot be set down as unwarrantable. Besides, the whole discussion is conducted in the coolest and most impartial spirit, every objection being fairly met and examined. Professor Smith displays no passion or enthusiasm. Indeed, hedged about and limited on every hand by the axioms

and rules of inexorable mathematics, he is *unable* to rise to that region where a single dip of fancy's wing carries the philosopher, and in which assumption is safe, and conceit grows sublime. He does not chafe like an eagle chained to a rock; but he accepts the facts of the situation, and patiently labors to prove a unity of design. Therefore, he is not satisfied by showing the harmony between the coffer, the wall-lines, and the symbol over the door, but advances one more step, by demonstrating that the cubic contents of the coffer form *one fiftieth of the contents of the chamber itself*. This proves beyond question that the chamber was constructed commensurably with the coffer, with fifty and five as the ruling numbers.

One might suppose that the proofs could well afford to end here, but such is not the case; for the stones still continue to cry out against the sepulchral theory, and declare for a wise, grand, and beneficent metrological use. On examining the layers, of which the Great Pyramid is composed, it is found that the stones decrease in thickness as we ascend, and that *the top of the fiftieth is level with the floor upon which the coffer stands*, thus adding a crowning proof of the author's view.

The limited space that can be given to an Article requires us to pass over with a few words that branch of the pyramid question which relates to a standard of heat. So far as the calculations go, they prove that the King's Chamber was designed to record the mean temperature of the earth's surface, fixing an even temperature by means of the air passages. In the same way we must treat the subject of angle, which the pyramid builder perfectly understood, and go on now to consider the question of a sabbatical week which is taught in the Great Pyramid.

Says Professor Smith, "Of all the internal architecture of the Great Pyramid, the grand gallery leading to the King's Chamber is the most unique, anomalous, colossal, and hitherto entirely unexplained. Why, for instance, was it made so enormously high, when the passages, both before and behind it, are so distressingly small; these so low that no man can move through them without stooping painfully, the other so high that a visitor's torch can hardly show him the roof; and all this in a building where our careful inspection of the joints, sizes, qualities, and fittings of the stones convinced us that everything had been well considered and

thoroughly calculated beforehand, with a view to the maximum of economy, combined with efficiency, for some worthy purpose ? ”

On finding that the direction of the celestial equator enters the north end of the grand gallery, it was thought that this gallery had some reference to *time*, while the *seven* architectural overlappings on the side of the walls might refer to the seven days in the week. This led further to the idea, that, while the grand gallery symbolized a *week*, the small passage signified a day. If this were so, then the measure of one must be seven times that of the other. Accordingly, careful measures were made, giving as the mean height of the small gallery 48.4 inches, and that of the grand gallery 339.5. And when the division is made we have the wonderfully exact number of 7.014. Thus, as has been well observed, a division of seven, suddenly occurring in a building generally devoted to tens and fives, shows that it was no mistake or accident, but points emphatically to a deliberate design.

This division of seven is also repeated twice in the Queen's Chamber, which is situated far below the King's, being celebrated for the original whiteness of the stone and the microscopic fineness of the finish. Here is found a room that is seven-sided like a geometrical figure. But what are the proportions of the seven sides as to area ? The figures relating to this point are too complicated to be given ; but the secret unlocked is, the culmination of the various symbols of a week like the Hebrew week, consisting of six ordinary days, and terminated by a seventh day larger and nobler than the rest. And, what is more, the standard of linear measure used by the builder in planning this symbolical room was the sacred cubit of the Hebrews elsewhere employed, and which is one-ten-millionth of the earth's semi-axis of rotation.

It may, indeed, be said here that no number of coincidences make a proof, and that there may be no *design* in the pyramid after all. The same mode of reasoning might also be employed in regard to a human body or a watch, a bee's cell or a world ; so that by this method the Almighty himself could be thrust out of the universe. We prefer, therefore, with due reservation, to claim for Jeeseh, the Great Pyramid, a design, and to inquire who was the designer.

This brings us to the last point now to be considered, the *origin* of the Great Pyramid.

On ordinary principles the discussion of this point should have

come sooner ; yet the reader will readily perceive that all that has gone before constitutes so much necessary preparation.

One thing to be noted is, that *all* the pyramids have a peculiar character which separates them from all other monuments. And of these Jeeseh is the oldest and the best. Lepsius even thinks that it is older than all the monuments, of every description, now existing in Egypt. We are thus forced to the conclusion that the pyramids were exotics. The idea did not *grow* there, but appeared in full at the beginning, and took such deep root that it never was entirely lost, so that pyramid building for a long time afterwards continued to go on. Hence we ask again, and not without wonder, whence did the pyramid idea come?

The pyramidal structures in other parts of the earth afford no clew to the answer, as they belong to a later date. But we need not apply our investigations to any except the Great Pyramid, for the reason that they have no metrology, and are only poor imitations of the principal structure, which was designed by its builder to stand in sublime solitariness in all ages.

First, was it the work of the Egyptians? That Egyptian labor cut the stones and laid them in position there can be no doubt ; but all the wisdom of Egypt fails when we inquire into their capacity to devise the *plan*. If the plan was the offspring of the Egyptians, why did they fail to leave their impress on the work? Besides, the metrology of the Great Pyramid is not the metrology in use in that country at the time it was built. But what is worse, their learning was insufficient. Bunsen himself says that they possessed "no really scientific knowledge" of mechanics and the cognate mathematical principles. Their astronomy, too, he declares, like everything Egyptian, was strictly provincial and calculated for the meridian of Egypt. The Egyptians were in fact the Chinese of the earlier world. Other writers, equally learned, inform us that astronomy among the Egyptians was not that mathematical science which calculates the movements of the stars, but rather a collection of notes of phenomena. The "wisdom of the Egyptians" which Moses knew, had not been developed at the date of the first pyramid. Renan himself confesses that not "a revolutionist, not a reformer, not a great poet, not a great artist, not a *savant*, not a philosopher, is met in its history."

So impressed was John Taylor by the vast scientific knowledge revealed in the pyramid, that he inclined to refer the plan to Divine

inspiration. Is there, then, any necessity for such a reference of the work? It might first be asked if such a course was ever pursued by the Divine Ruler.

An examination of the Bible soon settles this point. We read in Exodus xxxi. 1-5, "And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, See, I have called by name Bezaleel the son of Uri, the son of Hur, of the tribe of Judah: and I have filled him with the spirit of God, in wisdom, and in understanding, and in knowledge, and in all manner of workmanship, to devise cunning works, to work in gold, and in silver, and in brass, and in cutting of stones, to set them, and in carving of timber, to work in all manner of workmanship."

This view is powerfully supported by the learned John David Michaelis of Göttingen, in his great work on the Mosaic Laws. Professor Smith's own labors on this point are of extreme value; especially where, in the second volume of his last work, he identifies the Hebrew cubit with that of the pyramid, and proves that the Ark of the Covenant was *the same lidless-chest measure identical in cubic contents with the coffer of the Great Pyramid; while Solomon's molten sea was of the same cubical capacity as the lower marked-off course in the King's Chamber.*

But another inquiry is, were the people employed suitable for the work? The laborers were certainly qualified, on account of their great mechanical skill, notwithstanding their idolatry. But they probably had no conception of the value of their work, which was conducted according to a metrological system opposed to the profane cubit of Memphis. It is their masters whom we must regard as the *real* builders, and we know of nothing in *their* character that would disqualify them for such a task under the Divine direction.

All things considered, therefore, Professor Smith thinks there is nothing serious to prevent any one from holding that the plan *was* a Divine plan. Yet he does not commit himself to that view of the question. We are therefore still left to inquire further into the origin of the Great Pyramid.

Whether the architect was inspired or not, we do not undertake to say, but this seems certain, that he was a *foreigner*. John Taylor found that, according to his chronology, Noah was living at this period, and he inclined to believe that one so divinely instructed in the whole system of measures may have had some connection with

the Great Pyramid. Still no one can prove it, while as good a claim could be made for "Peleg and the sons of Joktan."

We indeed find no one mentioned in the Scriptures as sent into Egypt to engage in such works, but we do discover an allusion to families that *returned* from Egypt, or Caphthor, and settled in Palestine about the time the pyramid was built. We read in Deut. ii. 23, of "the Caphthorims, which came forth out of Caphthor, destroyed them, and dwelt in their stead." And if these Caphthorims were the builders, the allusion agrees with that tradition in Herodotus, which relates how the Egyptians despised the kings under whom the Great Pyramid was built, and would not even mention their names, saying either that it was built when the shepherd "Philition" fed his flocks near by, or that the pyramid was called after him, he being "the great enemy of the Egyptian gods." This Philition, Professor Smith observes, "looks exceedingly like a Scripture character," who was zealous for the true religion. Philition may then have been the identical person who led out the Caphthorims.

But, whatever may be the value of these suppositions, it is clear enough from the declarations of Scripture, that special instructions were from time to time given by the Almighty to aid in carrying on certain classes of works. One interesting point now therefore comes up in relation to the *period* at which such instructions were given. We ask, then, were such communications made to man in the age of the Great Pyramid?

This is not an essential point, but it is worthy of notice. Take the case of Noah's ark, and see if the divine instructions then issued were contemporaneous with the age of the pyramid. But when we inquire into the date of the Deluge of Noah, great confusion arises. The various authorities range from 2327 to 3246 B. C. Take the mean of *all* the dates, and we have the year 2741 B. C., which is too old to suit the purpose. But on this point individuals are left very much to themselves. The following communication, received in reply to a letter from Professor Smith, shows us that the Anglican Church has left her children to form their own conclusions:—

LAMBETH PALACE, S., 14th May, 1866.

SIR:—In reply to your inquiry, I write to inform you,

1. That the Church of England has assigned no date to the Noachian Deluge.

2. That the Church has not fixed any dates between which it must have taken place.

3. That the Church of England has not authorized the insertion into the authorized copy of the English Bible of any system of dates.

I have the honor to be, etc.,

(Signed)

C. T. CANTAUER.

According to this, any competent person may seek a date, without being considered an innovator. This Professor Smith has endeavored to do. Finding among the traditions of the Deluge the notion that there was some connection between its cessation and the stars in Taurus, he turns to the pyramid passage, and finds that *a Draconis* was last seen in the direction of that passage *when both traditionally and scripturally, the dangers were over and the evil effects of the Deluge had subsided*. And the computation gives *a Draconis* in its right position with reference to the passage when it was $3^{\circ} 42'$ from the pole in the year 2170 B. C. The old tradition in connection with Taurus is thus, by a series of severe calculations, rendered vocal and respectable, though the date which it gives to the Deluge is later than any before suggested. The object of this is simply to connect the period of the pyramid with the period of the ark, in which period the Almighty certainly gave to the human family instructions on the subject of metrology. Still, as already remarked, it is by no means necessary to connect the periods, for the reason that the Almighty could, so far as we know, have issued instruction on the general subject of metrology as consistently at one period as at another. The objection to the view is, of course, founded on the fact that nothing is directly said about the building of the pyramid in the Bible. We must remember, however, that the Bible is not an exhaustive compendium of the dealings of God with man.

But there are other features of the case, and it appears that metrology was a very suitable subject to be taught. In the earlier ages of society it would seem to have been demanded. From the time of Paucton, in France, to John Taylor, in England, there was frequent reference to passages of Scripture that seemed to indicate this. In Leviticus xix. 35-37, we read: "Ye shall do no unrighteousness in judgment, in meteyard, in weight, or in measure. Just balances, just weights, a just ephah, and a just hin, shall ye have. *I am* the Lord your God, which brought you out of the land of Egypt."

In Deut. xxv. 15, it is said: "Thou shall have a perfect and just weight, a perfect and just measure." See also Proverbs xi. 1, xvi. 11; Ezekiel xlv. 9, 10, 11. And having given the people such express commands, is it unreasonable to suppose that the Almighty may have at some time imparted a perfect standard by which all might regulate their transactions? At least the pyramid system of weights and measures was one that the Egyptians were incapable of devising in that age, which was the age of Shofa, about 2200 B. C.

It must be observed *again* on this point that Professor Smith does not claim the pyramid system as Divine revelation, but is only showing that no real objection can be made to the view.

Most persons will perhaps say that, if this theory were true, we might expect *some* recognition of the pyramid in the Bible. But *have* we no recognition of Jeeseh in the Bible?

Professor Smith anticipates the question. Townsend makes the date of the book of Job fall within about forty years of the date of the Great Pyramid; and we read there (chap. iii. 13, 14), "For now should I have lain still and been quiet, I should have slept: then had I been at rest, with kings and counsellors of the earth, which built desolate places for themselves."

Instead of "*desolate places*," Gliddon and others read *pyramids*. Dr. Bonar also points out in Lamentation, which book was probably written in Egypt, the following verse: "He hath set me in dark places [pyramids] as they that be dead of old." Lam. iii. 6.

The passages in Job xxxviii. 4-7, and Ephesians ii. 19, are much more to the point, but the discussions are so lengthy that the reader must be referred to the works of Taylor and Professor Smith. Yet all this does not touch the question of the *real* origin of the Great Pyramid. We know its age, but whence came the *plan*?

If we deny that it was a Divine communication, we may still accept the solution afforded by Herodotus, who teaches that Jeeseh was designed by one who was a stranger in Egypt. This person may have been Philition the shepherd, who thus, in conjunction with Shofa, ruled the idolatrous people with an iron hand. From the description of Shofa's statue, which has recently been discovered, we should expect to find in the king a ready listener to the grand lessons taught in the pyramid. Seated in the calmness of majesty and the isolation of rank, he is represented as gazing hon-

estly straightforward, intent upon high thought. He was evidently a man of administrative ability, while his air is that of one who can afford to bide his time, having intelligence beaming from his large eyes and lips that tell of peace. The wise and beneficent rule of this man was an abomination unto the Egyptians, who labored unwittingly to build the Great Pyramid.

At present, the *origin* of the pyramid idea has not been satisfactorily made known, though we know its approximate age, and something, no doubt, of its deep meaning. And though Professor Smith has not unlocked every secret of Jeeseh, he has nevertheless done a noble work. In connection with the patient John Taylor, he has given the Great Pyramid a tongue. It is no longer a senseless mountain of stone. It is idle to view it as a tomb, or indeed even as a thing merely of the past; for, whether original design or not, all its chambers and courses are vocal, teaching mankind how to appear upright and just.

We see, therefore, what great advancement has been made in pyramid interpretation; and, whether we accept every new conclusion or not, it must be clear that the sepulchral theory has had its day. What fresh revelations are in store we cannot conjecture; but, arguing from the past, we have reason to hope for the future, confidently anticipating the time when that indomitable spirit of scientific research, already so conspicuous in its triumphs, will add lasting confirmation to what is now inferred. And then, when the scholar lingers in meditation among the monuments of Egypt, he will no longer view the mysterious Sphinx as an appropriate guardian to the Great Pyramid, but rather as an idolatrous intrusion which admits of no justification before a matchless structure, reared with a blameless design, and in entire conformity with the just precepts of the TRUE GOD.

ART. IV.—SUFFRAGAN BISHOPS.

An Account of Church Government and Governors. By THOMAS BRETT, LL. D. 2d ed. London. 1710.

The Restoration of Suffragan Bishops recommended. By JOHN HENRY NEWMAN. London. 1835.

Collier's Eccl. History. Folio. London. 1714.

Bingham's Antiquities. London. 1850.

Hawks' Ecclesiastical Contributions.

IN these days of Church enterprise and advancement, it is of the greatest importance that churchmen should be thoroughly informed in all matters of Ecclesiastical History and precedent, which may throw light upon the future from the experience of the past.

As American churchmen, we have our future, under God, entirely in our own keeping. "State-free and Pope-free," as we sow we shall reap. We can organize, systematize, divide, associate our ecclesiastical forces, as we will. We can make Rural Deans, Arch-Deacons, Deans and Chapters, Coadjutors, *Vicarii in pontificalibus*, Assistant-Bishops, Chorepiscopi, Metropolitans, Patriarchs, Exarchs, and Autocephali. There is nothing, but our deep sense of responsibility, to hinder any experiment we choose to make, within the limits of catholic order; and upon the stability of the foundations which are now being laid depends, largely, the future of the cause of evangelical truth and apostolical order in this fair land of ours: a land whose population may, in the next half century, outstrip our most sanguine expectations. While, within that period, these United States must be won for Christ by the American Catholic Church or by the Roman. There are no other competitors. It is a tremendous responsibility. And the present activity of the Church's mind proves that we are not wholly insensible to the needs of the hour. On all sides we hear of plans devised and consummated for the division of Dioceses, the revival of the convocational system,—of Bishop's Churches and Associate Missions, of Sisterhoods, and other lay organizations. Much is being said and written of the See principle and the Provincial system. It is almost certain that the General Convention will yield more and more to the increasing clamor for "more Bishops," and repeal all obstructive legislation concerning Dio-

cesan subdivision. Great progress has already been made in the recovery of Church principles out of neglect and oblivion; and the movement is a cumulative one that gathers momentum by its own advances.

Yet the earnest churchman, looking to the sore need of instant action, commensurate, in some degree, with the wants of the times, cannot but feel that many precious years will be lost in overcoming the *conservatism* of the Church. Small Dioceses, in any primitive and proper sense of the term, are not going to be an accepted fact in a year, or two, or ten. Whatever may be said of the Eastern Church, the traditions of the North and West of Europe are uniformly in favor of Dioceses of considerable extent. Our own American Dioceses, in point of territory, are an exaggeration of this tradition beyond all precedent. But, then, New York has only 311 Parishes while the Diocese of Norwich has 909 benefices, besides curacies; Lincoln, 801; Exeter, 700; Litchfield, 698. And, of the 28 English Sees, only 6 are smaller than New York in number of Parishes. These are facts which the opponents of *division* seize upon, and use adroitly. We cannot afford to pass them by with a contemptuous sneer. We have to show that *extent of territory* is an important element in the problem of Episcopal supervision, and to meet, squarely, a host of objections, wise and otherwise, springing out of strong conviction and deep-rooted prejudice, in favor of retaining for our Diocesans something of the temporal dignity that attaches to extensive jurisdiction. We have, also, to meet that *Presbyterial*, we say not *Presbyterian*, spirit which has been developed and nurtured in the Church by long immunity from Episcopal supervision, and which causes many to resent the proposition of a Bishop with time and opportunity to do anything more than "reach the Church in time for service, confirm, and hurry away by the next train." "Small Dioceses will make small Bishops," is another potent cry, that is not without some justification in primitive experience. While the rank and file of the Church have yet to learn the true nature of the office of a Bishop, and are, practically, as slow to begin the lesson as so many Congregationalists or Presbyterians.

We propose in this Article to discuss a question which we do not remember to have seen handled in any of our current Church periodicals, in the hope that it may be of service to the Church at this juncture. We refer to the expedient of Suffragan Bishops.

We suspect that very few churchmen have any distinct idea of this species of Episcopacy, beyond the fact that it is prohibited in the American Church by Title I., Canon XIII., Section 5, of the Digest. Of this Canon, Dr. Hawks says : —

“ With all deference, we doubt its propriety. When a Diocesan needs help, a Suffragan, and nothing else, is just what he ought to have. We think that the time will come when the Church will discover this and alter her present law. We have ever felt that, if the nature of a Suffragan’s rights and duties had been thoroughly understood, our Canon would never have been such as it is. Nay, we go farther, and express the deliberate conviction that Suffragans are less likely to disturb the peace and harmony of a Diocese than our present plan of Assistant-Bishops. It has sometimes been amusing to witness the panic dread exhibited at thought of a Suffragan, by those who, in the very next breath, proved that they were perfectly innocent of any accurate knowledge of what a Suffragan is. *In rejecting Suffragans we think the Church made an unwise departure from venerable antiquity.*”¹

Under cover of which high authority, we proceed with our subject : premising that its full consideration will necessitate, at least, a glance at the whole question of Bishops’ assistants in all their varieties.

The term “Suffragan” is used in three senses. First. It is sometimes, *incorrectly*, applied to the Coadjutor and Titular Bishops of the period A. D. 1000–1500.

Second. It is, correctly, applied to Diocesan Bishops who are said to be Suffragans to their Metropolitan. We will call these, for distinction’s sake, “Provincial Suffragans.”

Third. It is, strictly, applied to Bishops holding a more or less restricted jurisdiction over a *District* within the Diocese of another Bishop. We shall call these “Diocesan’s Suffragans.”

That all Bishops are coequal in respect of *Orders* from the beginning of Christianity, is true ; but, from the beginning also, Episcopal *mission* and *jurisdiction* have been unequally distributed. All such inequality is of ecclesiastical order, and not of Divine right, yet is a matter within the power of the Church that all things may be done decently. The apostolic commission was, “Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature.” Diocesan Episcopacy, which restricts every Bishop’s jurisdiction to his own *measure*, is itself a modification of the apostolic commission. A modification sanctioned from the first by the

¹ Hawks’ *Ecclesiastical Contributions*, II. 385.

Apostles themselves, when they set James, the Lord's brother, over the Church in Jerusalem.

St. Paul, "conferring not with flesh and blood," exercised his mission *at large*, by retaining in his own hands the care and inspection of the Churches which he planted, even after he had set Bishops over them. We find him early associating with himself others, Apostles, at large, who exercised their office in subordination to himself. Thus the names of Timothy and Silas, or Silvanus, appear in connection with his own name in the inscriptions of his Epistles, while the names of others, his constant companions in travel and work, appear only among the salutations at the end of the same Epistles. Even St. Luke's name occupies this subordinate position, and the inspired Evangelist was certainly in no wise inferior in personal gifts and graces to Timothy and Silas. There is no evidence that Silas ever became a Diocesan Bishop. He continued to assist St. Paul as his vicar and deputy for some time.¹ And afterwards served, in the same capacity, with St. Peter.² His name always precedes that of Timothy in the inscriptions, and he was a chief man³ among the brethren at Jerusalem, before he was *chosen*⁴ by St. Paul.

Timothy was in like manner employed by St. Paul as a Deputy-Bishop, being sent to Corinth⁵ to preside over the Synod ordered to be convened by St. Paul, and, on somewhat similar errands, to Thessalonica,⁶ and to Macedonia.⁷ Returning to Ephesus from Macedonia, he was placed by St. Paul over the Church in that city.⁸ And the two Epistles addressed to him show that St. Paul still regarded him as a subordinate and an assistant, as he did also Titus, in Crete.

After the period of the twelve Apostles, all Bishops had a restricted jurisdiction, as the last of the twelve, St. John, had himself in Ephesus. And that there were degrees of rank and subordination among the Bishops of the second and third centuries is evident from the decree of the Council of Nice, which speaks of the precedence of the Sees of Alexandria, Rome, Antioch and *Ælia*, as an ancient custom (A. D. 325).⁹

But the restriction of jurisdiction had, long before the Council

¹ Acts xv. 40, xvi. 19, etc.; 2 Cor. i. 19.

² Acts xv. 22.

³ 1 Thess. iii. 1, 2, 6.

⁴ Conc. Nic., Canon 6.

⁵ Acts xv. 40.

⁶ Acts xix. 22.

⁷ 1 Pt. v. 12.

⁸ 1 Cor. iv. 17.

⁹ 1 Tim. i. 3.

⁹ Conc. Nic., Canon 6. "Let ancient customs prevail, as, for instance, those in Egypt, Lybia, and Pentapolis; that the Bishop of Alexandria have power over all these, since the

of Nice, appeared in another form in the order of Chorepiscopi, Village Bishops, Country Bishops, or Diocesans' Suffragans, who held the same relation to Diocesan Bishops that Silvanus and Timotheus held to St. Paul, being Bishops delegate, acting under the authority of another Bishop and within his Diocese. These *Χωρεπίσκοποι* are not to be confounded with the *μικροπόλῆται*, or "little Bishops" of the same period. The policy of the Church had been, from the first, to seize and act upon the great cities and centres of population, in sure confidence that the work of evangelization would be self-radiating thence to the remotest corners of civilization. Next, the lesser cities and market towns were occupied as Episcopal Sees. Every Bishop had the right of dividing his own Diocese and erecting new Sees, with the consent of a Provincial Council, or, later, of his Metropolitan. Hence arose the "little Bishops," Bishops of lesser cities, who were nevertheless full Diocesans, of equal powers with the greater Bishops, but of secondary importance in popular estimation. But, after the cities, the rural towns and villages claimed attention. The Bishop's Church in the city was the nucleus of all Church extension, and, primarily, the only Church to which all the faithful in the neighborhood resorted. With the growth of the Church in any city came the necessity of providing other places of worship, which were served by Priests and Deacons from the Bishop's Church, in conformity with the rule that there should be but one Bishop in a city. And the same provision, at first, sufficed for the surrounding villages, the faithful attaching themselves to the jurisdiction of the nearest city Bishop, and receiving Priests and Deacons from him. But the primitive idea of the Episcopate, as the soul of Church life, was too strong to suffer even the villages to be long deprived of this necessary office, and thus upon the heels of the second class of Bishops came a third class, the *Chorepiscopi*. Whether these also were originally Diocesan Bishops, cannot now be determined. It is probable that in some provinces they were, as in Africa, where the *Chorepiscopi* were very numerous, and hardly distinguishable from the city Bishops. In other provinces, however, it is likely that they were Suffragans to Diocesan Bish-

same is customary for the Bishop of Rome. Likewise, in Antioch, and other provinces, let the privileges be secured to the Churches."

Canon 7. "Saving to the Metropolis its proper dignity, let the Bishop of Ælia have the next place of precedence, because custom and ancient tradition have obtained that he should be honored."

ops; while in still a third instance, there would seem to have been but one Diocesan in a province, all the other Bishops being *Chorepiscopi*, Diocesan's Suffragans to him. Thus St. Basil, Bishop of Cæsarea and Exarch (ob. 379), is said to have had no less than fifty *Chorepiscopi* under him.¹ And St. Basil, in one of his epistles, berates them soundly, for presuming to act as if they were Diocesans.²

And that the same custom obtained in other places, and is not yet extinct in the Greek Church, may appear from a letter of Cyril, Patriarch of Alexandria, dated September 22, 1613, in which he says that "the Patriarch of Alexandria, for reasons too long to be related, has no Archbishops or Bishops under him, but only *Chorepiscopi*, who are vicars or substitutes, and differ from Bishops only in this, that a Bishop, in his own Diocese, may ordain, constitute, and appoint, according to his own pleasure, but the *Chorepiscopi* cannot do any of these things but by commission from their superiors."³

Whatever may have been the original independence of the *Chorepiscopi*, it is certain that by the close of the third century they had become, universally, Diocesan's Suffragans. The circumstances of their origin and situation would, naturally, make them very deferential to the city Bishops, and facilitate the deprivation of their Diocesan character, if it ever existed. Nor was this change, if change it were, an *unnecessary innovation*. It was not an innovation, for St. Paul had his Suffragans, as we have seen. And it was not unnecessary, for the entrusting of the Episcopate to small and obscure Sees was a measure full of peril. Such Bishops would hardly be chosen with the same jealous carefulness as those for cities. The Bishops of "little cities" did harm enough in giving *Orders* to schismatics and heretics, as Novatian,

¹ Bingham IX. 8.

² "It is a sad thing to see how the Canons of the Fathers are laid aside, insomuch that it is to be feared all will come to confusion. The ancient custom was that there should be strict enquiry made into the lives of those who were to be admitted to minister in the Church. The care of this lay upon the Presbyters and Deacons, who were to report it to the *Chorepiscopi*, and they, having received a good testimony of them, certified it to the Bishop, and so the Minister was admitted into Holy Orders. But now you *Chorepiscopi* would make me stand for a cypher, and take all the authority to yourselves. But let me have a note of the Ministers of every village, and know that he shall be reputed but a Layman, whoever he is that is received into the Ministry without our consent." Ep. 181. Brett, pp. 230, 231.

³ Brett, p. 230.

who invited three of them to his house, feasted, flattered, and made them drunk, and so procured Episcopal consecration.¹

So marked was the restriction of the jurisdiction of *Chorepiscopi* at the beginning of the third century, that many writers have concluded that they were not Bishops at all, but only Presbyters exercising Archidiaconal functions. A copious list of authorities on either side of this question is cited by Bingham, who decides, positively, in favor of their Episcopal character. Indeed, the same Canons which speak of the *Chorepiscopi*, clearly distinguish them from the "visiting Presbyters." They could confirm, give the minor orders, exercise visitatorial powers, and, with the license of the Diocesan, give Holy Orders, and sit and vote in Councils with other Bishops.

They were recognized as an existing class of Bishops by the Council of Ancyra, A. D. 315.² By the Council of Neo Cesarea circ. A. D. 315.³

Fifteen Bishops subscribe themselves "*Chorepiscopus*" at the Council of Nice, A. D. 315,⁴ which also decreed⁵ that schismatical Bishops returning to communion might be assigned by the Catholic Bishop as *Chorepiscopi*.

The Council of Antioch, A. D. 341, also defined the jurisdiction of "*Chorepiscopi*," conceding their right to grant letters dimissory to the Clergy, while denying that right to the Presbyters; acknowledging their orders, while restricting their mission, showing them to be exactly what we understand by a Diocesan's Suffragan.⁶

The recognition of the Church by the State introduced great changes in ecclesiastical dignities of all sorts. Newman says that

¹ In this case, as in those of Fortunatus and Felicissimus, the *numerosity* of the Episcopate had an attendant evil, that ordination could sometimes be procured in violation of the Canons. The Bishops of the smaller Sees were not always "*shining lights*." Mahan, Ch. Hist. III. 3, note.

² Can. 13. "It is not allowed that a country Bishop do ordain priests or deacons," that is, without the Diocesan.

³ Can. 13. Country Presbyters may not make the oblation in the city Church, if the Bishop or city Presbyter be present; nor yet, give the bread or cup with prayer. But if they be absent, and one of the country Presbyters be called to prayer, he alone may give them. But the country Bishops are in imitation of the Seventy, and as being fellow officers in the same Liturgy (with the city Bishop), may make the oblation.

⁴ Bingham II.; XIV. 5.

⁵ Canon 8.

⁶ Conc. Ant., Can. 8. "Let not country Presbyters send canonical letters, or, however, only to neighboring Bishops; but let country Bishops, who are of good reputation, give pacific letters."

Can. 10. "The Synod decrees that though country Bishops have received Episcopal ordination, yet they keep within their bounds, and administer the affairs of the Churches

the city Bishops, after their accession to temporal dignity, became jealous of an order, their equals in spiritual dignity, but their inferiors in secular consideration, and who were an obstacle to their monarchical aspirations. Certain it is, that from this period the *Chorepiscopi* begin to disappear. The Council of Laodicea (A. D. 367) gave them the first blow, by decreeing that no more country Bishops should be consecrated. But that visiting presbyters (*ἐπι-οδευταὶ*) be substituted in their room.¹

The See of Rome also, in the person of Damasus (elected 366 A. D.), put its foot upon the country Bishops and never relented until they were finally abolished by the aid of the Forged Decretals in the ninth century.²

Hence, among the schoolmen and canonists it is a received opinion that the *Chorepiscopi* were only Presbyters.³

Neither the decrees of a local Council like that of Laodicea, nor, at that early day, the fiat of a Bishop of Rome could put down an order which had its rise in primitive zeal and apostolic example. It lingered on for centuries, except where it was kept under "by the Pope's tyranny."⁴

The Council of Chalcedon,⁵ A. D. 451, recognizes the country Bishops, but the *Chorepiscopi*, who sign its decrees, sign in the names of their Diocesans, and not, as at Nice, in their own names.

With the growth of the Papacy, *Chorepiscopi* were supplanted by Titular or Coadjutor Bishops, who, being nominated by the Pope himself, depended more immediately upon his Holiness than the Diocesans' Suffragans, who might even, according to the ancient Canons, be consecrated by a single Bishop. And it is worthy of remark that the office of a *Chorepiscopus* flourished wherever the authority of the Popes waned, or failed to extend. This is true, as we have seen, of the Greek Church, and of the Church of England, where *Chorepiscopi* existed until the time of Lanfranc and the Norman conquest. The Reformed Church of Bohemia,

subject to them, and be content with the care and management of them, and ordain Readers and Subdeacons and Exorcists; and content themselves with the power of promoting men to these offices, and do not dare to ordain a Presbyter or a Deacon without the Bishop of the city to which they themselves and their districts are subject."

¹ Can. 57. That no more country Bishops be ordained but visitors itinerant; that they, who have formerly been ordained, do nothing without the Bishop's consent.

² "From whence this third order (*Chorepiscopi*) is come, we cannot tell, and the thing that wanteth reason must needs be rooted up." Damasus quoted by Jewell, Park, Soc. Ed. IV. 801.

³ Bingham II.; XIV. 2.

⁴ Bingham II.; XIV. 12.

⁵ Canon 2.

deriving its succession from the Waldenses, has, besides its Bishops, certain called *Conseniores*, and *Chorepiscopi*, to whom the Presbyters promise obedience.

In the year 940, Leo VII. decided, in answer to a question propounded by Gerard, a German Archbishop, that the *Chorepiscopi* might not confirm, consecrate, or ordain. This decision was sustained by the Council of Ratisbon. But Rabanus, the learned Archbishop of Mentz, boldly defended the rights of the *Chorepiscopi*, maintaining that their order had its original from the Apostles; that Linus and Clemens were *Chorepiscopi* to SS. Peter and Paul in the Church at Rome; accusing those Bishops, who would overthrow the institution, of ambition, and claiming that the *Chorepiscopi* were established for the sake of the poor in the country, that they might not be deprived of confirmation.¹

The revival of *Chorepiscopi*, or Diocesan's Suffragans, was one of the first acts of the English Reformation, as we shall presently see; while the Pope's Legates at the Council of Trent labored to maintain that all Bishops are of Ecclesiastical appointment, and none of divine right, except the Pope himself.

Of the early British Church it is impossible to speak with any confidence. The number of Bishops in Britain² was very large, and this is one of the chief incidental proofs of the Oriental origin of the British Church. The Scottish Bishops had no territorial jurisdiction at all, until A. D. 851, being Bishops *at large*, exercising their office wherever they came, with a more or less definitely acknowledged subjection to the Archbishop of York. One of the famous Sampsons, A. D. 591, was consecrated a Bishop at large, by the Archbishop of Canterbury. And, A. D. 670, we find Theodore of Canterbury consecrating one Edbed Bishop, and assigning to him jurisdiction over the Church and Abbey of Ripon. Bertha, wife of Ethelbert, King of Kent, a Christian, and the daughter of Clotaire, King of the Franks, was attended by a Bishop, as keeper of her conscience, who had his cathedral Church of St. Martins, in the suburbs of Canterbury; and that Church con-

¹ Dupin, VII. pp. 164, 165, quoted by Brett, p. 216.

² It is said that there were 118 British Bishops present at the Council of Brevy, against Pelagius. In the year of the Council of Arles, A. D. 314, there were three Metropolitan Sees in Britain, and the Primate of *Caeleion upon Usk* had but seven Diocesans under him. It would be difficult to assign the remaining one hundred and ten as Diocesans, or Provincial Suffragans to the other two Archbishops. And it is not unfair to conclude that most of them were country Bishops, or *Chorepiscopi*.

tinued to be presided over by a *Chorepiscopus*, until the time of Lanfranc, 1060 A. D.

Singular irregularities however obtained in the British Church, the Abbots of great monasteries often having a supremacy over the Bishops resident in them.¹ And in the Constitutions of the Synod of Becanceld, A. D. 694, we find the names of five *Abbesses* preceding the signatures of one Botrea, a Bishop.

On the other hand, we must consider that all British monasticism took its model from the monastery of St. Colomba, in Iona, where the Bishop was certainly subject to the Abbot, though a Presbyter: of which Bede remarks that it was an unusual thing. But at Iona, there was a reason for it as unusual as the thing itself. For, whereas in almost all other places there were Bishops before there were any monasteries, and there it was not lawful to build any monastery without leave of the Bishop; at Iona, on the contrary, there was no Christian before S. Colomba came thither. And when Colomba had converted the King and his people, the King gave him the royalty of Iona and the six neighboring isles. And, therefore, though Colomba found it necessary to have a Bishop, it is not strange that he thought fit to keep the royalty to himself and his successors. For even now, the Bishop of Oxford has no jurisdiction over any private scholar of the University, although recourse must be had to him for every Episcopal act.²

While that the Abbots of Iona, and that even within the monastery itself, recognized the Episcopate as a superior office, is proved by Collier,³ who relates a story of a Bishop, taking refuge in the monastery, in disguise, whom S. Colomba detecting, desired him that he would exercise the privilege of his Order, and break the bread alone. And the same historian further remarks, that "when we meet with a restraint of the Bishop's jurisdiction in the Abbey charters, we are not to understand it of *spiritual* jurisdiction, without express mention.⁴ It is not at all unlikely that every large monastery had its resident *Chorepiscopus*, who, in temporalities, was entirely subject to the Abbot, which would not conflict with the supremacy of the *Diocesans* over all monasteries. The exemption of particular Abbeys from Episcopal visitation and jurisdiction was a later invention of the Pope's."⁵

As a further evidence of the irregularities prevailing in these

¹ Vit. S. Sansoni, in Mabillon. Hist. Ben. Ord. Tom. I.

² Brett, 106, 107.

³ I. 60.

⁴ Collier, I. 198.

⁵ Collier, passim.

times in Britain, we find St. David, in the latter part of the fifth century, removing his Archiepiscopal See from Caerleon to Me-nevia, now called St. David's, on account of the *populousness* of the former city, which, according to the ancient canons, was the very best reason for continuing at Caerleon.

Nor were these irregularities much lessened in the Saxon Church, which was begun by uncanonical consecrations of Bishops, by a single Bishop (St. Augustine), and which was kept in a state of constant confusion by the incessant wars among the petty kingdoms, and the alternate predominance and depression of Christianity in them. The hierarchy, contemplated by Gregory, consisted of two Metropolitans, of York and Canterbury, with twelve Provincial Suffragans each. But for a long period we find that there was but one Bishop in a kingdom. Bede gives a list of sixteen Sees, A. D. 731, of which twelve were in Canterbury and four in York; but some of these were evidently British Sees, not Saxon. In his letter to the Archbishop of York, written some years after his Ecclesiastical History, he earnestly insists upon the order of Gregory, by which York was to have twelve Sees, "because in some woody and almost impassable parts of the country, there were seldom any Bishops came to confirm." He suggests the confiscation of some of the monasteries for the erection of new Sees, and that "to prevent opposition from the *religious* of that house, they be softened with some concessions, and allowed to choose the Bishop out of their own society, and that the joint government of the Diocese and the monastery should be placed in his hands."

The Roman origin of the Saxon Church would of itself tend to the discouragement of *Chorepiscopi*. But it is certain that the Church of St. Martins, Canterbury, had its *Chorepiscopus*.¹

¹ "Sieward, Abbot of Abington, and *Chorepiscopus* of Canterbury, A. D. 1050, in the disability of the Archbishop Eadius, appropriated the Episcopal revenues to his own use, and hardly allowed his Diocesan the necessities of life." Collier, I. 220.

Lanfranc rebuilt Christ Church from its foundations (it had been burnt by the Danes). He settled the number of monks at 150, and gave them a Prior, instead of a *Chorepiscopus* Collier, I. 260.

"Formerly many Bishops had Suffragans, who were consecrated as other Bishops were. These in the absence of the Bishops did supply their places in matters of orders, but not of jurisdiction. They were anciently called *Chorepiscopi* by way of distinction from the Bishops of the cities. Much jealousy seems to have been entertained at one period toward the *Chorepiscopi*, who were denied to possess Episcopal authority. This led to the abolition of the order by Lanfranc, and the gradual substitution of Titular Bishops, as Coadjutors." Rogers' *Ecclesiastical Law*, p. 108.

At the Synod of Calcinth, twelve Bishops subscribe, most of whom append no mention of their Sees to their names. Had they any ?

At a Northumbrian Synod, of about the same date, six Bishops subscribe, whereas York had then but four Diocesans. It is possible, however, that the other two were Scottish Bishops. The Archbishop of York had long claimed canonical obedience from the Scottish Bishops *at large*, a claim which was not finally conceded by those Bishops until 1172 A. D. But even with this admission, it is difficult to distinguish these Scottish Bishops from *Chorepiscopi*.

The Irish Church also shows a trace of *Chorepiscopi* before the time of Lanfranc. For the second Archbishop of Dublin having made his submission to Lanfranc as Primate, Lanfranc writes a letter to Torlogh, King of Dublin, A. D. 1085, complaining of certain irregularities in the Irish Church. Among which he notes that certain Bishops were ordained by *one* Bishop (which was canonical in the case of a *Chorepiscopus*), and that a single borough was often governed by a plurality of Bishops (which is unparalleled in Ecclesiastical records, unless the excess were *Chorepiscopi*.)

After the conquest, William separated the Ecclesiastical from the Civil courts, thus throwing an enormous amount of new business upon the Bishops. To meet this emergency, Lanfranc divided his Diocese into Archdeaconries, and his example was soon followed by the other Bishops. Lincoln had as many as seven Archdeacons. The office of an Archdeacon arose in the East about the close of the third century. It was comparatively unknown in Britain before the ninth century. The division of Dioceses into Parishes did not begin much before A. D. 700, previously to which all rural Churches were chapels-of-ease to the Cathedral. Once begun, however, it made such rapid progress that by the beginning of the tenth century the parochial system was fully established. The first mention of an Archdeacon in England occurs at a Synod of Cloveshoe, A. D. 803, where we find one Wulfried mentioned as Archdeacon to Athelard of Canterbury.

Lanfranc's Archdeacons were, comparatively, a new institution in England, following in the track of the older hierarchies. They are not to be confounded with the Arch-presbyters or Deans of Chapters, who originated about the year 700, when the clergy, dispersing from the secular monasteries of the See to seats in

Parishes, a certain number of them were retained at the Bishop's Church as a Council, over whom the Dean was president. Nor, again, are they to be confounded with the Arch-priests who governed the communities of secular clergy who had taken refuge in the monasteries in the times of the Danes.

The Archdeacons were, and still are, of inferior rank to the Dean of a Chapter, who is an Arch-priest. Originally only the chief of the Deacons in the Bishop's Church, they came to be the confidential clerks of the Bishops, and thus were often sent by them on tours of inspection and observation. By the Canon Law the Archdeacon is called "the Bishop's Eye." So puffed up were some of them, by their importance in the Diocese, that canons of several Councils are aimed at their presumptuousness, forbidding them to celebrate the Holy Eucharist, or to thrust themselves forward to receive the Eucharist before the priests.

It does not appear at what period of English history the Archdeacons were selected from among the Presbyters. At a Synod of London, A. D. 1075, the Archdeacon of Canterbury signs before Abbots, but in a later Synod of London, A. D. 1102, a canon appears which requires that Archdeacons shall be Deacons. All the powers and rights of Archdeacons now rest upon immemorial custom and usage, and these vary greatly in the different Dioceses.

Rural Deans were of still more ancient origin in Britain. Southey¹ says that the Rural Deans (he calls them *Chorepiscopi*, and perhaps some of them were) were appointed by the clergy of a district with the Bishop's approval; and, later, by the Bishops absolutely. Cripp² surmises that some of the *Deans peculiars* originated in the Rural Deaneries of Saxon Christianity. Burn³ says that they were sometimes made *Chorepiscopi*, or Rural Bishops.⁴ At the period of the Reformation, the Rural Deans were

¹ *Book of the Church*, p. 25, Am. ed. 1844.

² *Law of Clergy*.

³ *Ecclesiastical Law*, I. 475. Lond. 1763.

⁴ Deans are of five kinds in English Ecclesiastical Law. 1. Deans of Provinces, or Deans of Bishops. The Bishop of London is Dean of the Province of Canterbury. The Diocese of Norwich also has its *perpetual Dean*, among its Rural Deans, who is the Bishop's Dean.

2. Honorary Deans, as the Dean of the Chapel Royal of St. James, who has his title in honor of the dignity of the person over whose chapel he presides.

3. Deans of peculiars. As the Dean of Bante in Sussex, a deanery founded by William the Conqueror, in memory of his conquest. The Dean of Croydon in Surrey, of Bocking in Essex, and many others, having jurisdiction with the care of souls, all of whom are of spiritual promotion.

The Dean of the Arches, the chief and most ancient court and consistory of the Arch-

well nigh supplanted by the Archdeacons. The duties of these latter were, as already remarked, various in different Dioceses.¹ These officers were commonly required to visit the Parishes of their jurisdiction once a year, to examine and present candidates for Holy Orders, and to exercise jurisdiction over Ecclesiastical cases of a certain kind, usually subject to an appeal to the Bishop's Court. But some Archdeacons are peculiars and independent of appeals to the Bishops.

But in the multitude of officials, the poor Bishops were being gradually, yet surely, deprived of their jurisdiction. Their rights and powers were being continually invaded by the Popes on the one hand, and by the Deans of Chapters on the other. While the Archdeacons, resting their rights upon usage, made such intolerable encroachments upon the independence and authority of the Diocesans, that most of the Bishops were driven to compromise with them. This led to the introduction of a new class of officers — new, that is in English history — who were styled Episcopal Vicars, or officials, and sometimes Coadjutors. Single examples of this class occur in the twelfth century. They became more common in the thirteenth. They might be either laymen or clerks, and exercised a delegate jurisdiction over such cases as were committed to them by the Bishops. They correspond to the first Archdeacons, in having no local jurisdiction. At the same time came in the custom of appointing Titular Bishops as assistants in matters of Orders, as the officials were in matters of jurisdiction. The Coadjutor Bishop and the official together thus performed the duties of a Diocesan.²

bishop of Canterbury, having jurisdiction without care of souls, may be of lay promotion.

4. Deans of Chapters. Arch-priests, rank next to Bishops. In some cases the Dean is coördinate with the Bishop. In some cases the Dean and Chapter together have a control over the Bishop, *i. e.* over the precincts of the cathedral, or over the temporalities of the See. Their duty is to act as a council of advice to the Bishop in Ecclesiastical cases, to elect the Bishop upon the occurrence of a vacancy in the See, and their consent is necessary to the validity of the Bishop's grants, leases, etc.

5. Rural Deans. A Saxon institution, afterwards mostly absorbed into Archdeaconries. Those which remained were ranked as subdivisions of Archdeaconries. The R. D. were anciently deputies of the Bishop planted all around the Diocese to inspect the conduct of the country clergy, to inquire into and report dilapidations, and to examine candidates for confirmation. To save them from being mere spies and informers, they were armed with an inferior degree of judicial and coercive jurisdiction in minuter matters. Cripp's *Law of Clergy*. Burn's *Ecclesiastical Law*.

¹ A canon of a Synod of Canterbury, 1175, orders that clerks wearing their hair long, be cropped by the Archdeacon at his visitation.

² Cripp's *Law of Clergy*, p. 81.

Some confusion arises from the fact that these officials, who were often laymen, are frequently styled "Coadjutors." In English law this title is applied to any person, lay or spiritual, to whom a Bishop delegates a portion of his jurisdiction, while the Coadjutor *Bishop* was called a Suffragan.

It is a tradition of Roman Ecclesiastical policy, never to recede from territory which has once been Christian, but to keep up the complement of Bishops in those countries which have relapsed into heathenism, and employ them for various purposes in other parts of the Catholic world. These are the Pseudo Suffragans of the Middle Ages, Titular Bishops, Bishops in *partibus infidelium*. They had been known in Spain ever since the Saracen invasion. In the thirteenth century some wealthy Bishops of the West began to employ their colleagues, who were driven at that time from the East, as "*Vicarii in pontificalibus*." After the complete conquest of Palestine, the banished Bishops wandered about the West in great numbers, offering their services everywhere, especially in Abbeys exempt from Episcopal supervision. The Council of Ravenna, 1314, calls them "vagabond Bishops," and doubts their propriety. In the fourteenth century, their Titular successors were generally established as Coadjutors to the Bishops of Germany, Spain, and Portugal; they were never tolerated in France.¹

Strype² says that these Coadjutors, called *Suffragans*, were not unusual in England before Henry VIII. And Anthony Harmer, quoted by Brett, says that "in many Dioceses, whose records are preserved, there appears a continuous series or succession of Suffragans, as well as of proper Bishops, for the space of two hundred years before the Reformation." The Archbishops of Canterbury were commonly assisted by certain called Bishops of Hippo and of Sidon. The following list may be interesting: —

- 1382. William Bottlesham, Ep. Navatensis, ———.
- 1401. John Greenlaw, Ep. Soltaniensis, Dioceses of Bath and Wells.
- 1443. James ———, Ep. Achadensis, Dioceses of Bath and Wells.
- 1459. Thomas Cornish, Bishop of Tine, Dioceses of Bath and Wells.
- 1485. Thomas Radcliffe, Bishop of Dromore, Diocese of Durham.
- 1498. Rd. Martin, Bishop *at large*, Diocese of Canterbury.
- Richard ———, Ep. Olevensis, Diocese of Worcester.
- 1503. John Hatton, Ep. Negropontus, Diocese of York.
- 1510. Thomas Vivian, Ep. Megarensis, Diocese of Exeter.
- 1536. Robert King, Ep. Roannensis, ———.

¹ Gieseler, *Ecclesiastical History*, III. § 64.

² Memorials Cranmer.

Mr. Wharton, at the time of his death, had in hand a treatise on the *Chorepiscopi* of England, of which he had collected an almost continuous succession in every Diocese, and in the Diocese of London no fewer than twenty-eight, between the years 1312-1540.

We come now to the restoration of true Suffragans, *Chorepiscopi*, District Bishops, which Cranmer labored to make one of the glories of the English Reformation.

It is notorious that Cranmer and his cotemporaries were eager for an increase of the Episcopate. His scheme looked to the creation of from fifteen to twenty new Sees, and the establishment of Suffragans in all the larger towns. He obtained an act of Parliament for the first measure, but succeeded in securing endowments averaging less than £400 per annum, for six Sees only, Bristol, Chester, Gloucester, Oxford, Peterborough, and Westminster. The last named did not survive its first Bishop.¹

In 1535, an act was obtained (26 Henry VIII. c. 14) authorizing the establishment of twenty-six Suffragans, who were divided to the several Dioceses, as follows:—

Canterbury, *Dover*; London, *Colchester*; Winchester, *Guilford*, *Southampton*, *Isle of Wight*; St. Asaphs, *none*; Bangor, *none*; Bath and Wells, *Taunton*, *Bridgewater*, *Bristol*;² Litchfield, *Shrewsbury*; Chichester, *none*; St. Davids, *none*; Ely, *Cambridge*; Exeter, *St. Germans*, *Gloucester*;³ Hereford, *none*; Landaff, *none*; Lincoln, *Bedford*, *Leicester*, *Grantham*, *Huntingdon*; Norwich, *Thetford*,⁴ *Ipswich*; Rochester, *none*; Salisbury, *Shaftesbury*, *Molton*, *Marlborough*; Worcester, *none*; York, *Hull*, *Nottingham*; Durham, *Berwick*; Carlisle, *Pereth*; —, *Penreth*.⁵

¹ "In 1539 an act of Parliament legalized the dissolution of the monasteries and granted their estates to the King. Cranmer was very anxious to secure this mine of wealth to the Church for his new Sees, and for educational purposes. This was not the first instance of Parliamentary interference with the Abbey lands. In 1414, all alien priories, not conventual, were dissolved by act of Parliament. Many colleges owe much of their wealth to this source, before the time of Wolsey, whose liberality of foundation consisted chiefly in suppressing a monastery to found a college in his own honor." Short. *Ch. Hist.* § 248, note.

² "The total yearly value of the monasteries now suppressed was not less than £150,000." Short. § 258 and note.

Besides the six Sees enumerated above, Cranmer obtained endowments amounting in the aggregate to £6,000 for fifteen new Chapters, which with a few hospitals, and Trinity College, Cambridge, and Christ Church, Oxford, exhausted King Harry's munificence. The rest of the spoils went to his favorites.

³ Was a Suffragan town until 1542, when it was erected into a See,

⁴ Was a Suffragan town until 1541, when it was erected into a See.

⁵ Had been a See, in the time of Lanfranc.

⁶ Is mentioned in the act as a Suffragan title, but there is no such English town.

The smaller Dioceses were left without Suffragans, while Lincoln, then numbering upward of twelve hundred Parishes, had as many as four.

The act creating these Suffragans did not oblige them to take their titles from a town in the Diocese in which they served, but this was soon regulated by custom.¹ It made no provision for their support, except that of allowing them to hold benefices with the privileges of plurality and non-residence. And their authority ceased with the revocation of their commissions. Their duties may be gathered from Cranmer's letter of commission to Rd. Ungworth, his Suffragan of Dover,² "to confirm, bless altars, chalices,

¹ "Forasmuch as no provision hitherto hath been made (*i. e.* by Parliament) for suffragans, which have been accustomed to be had within this realm (*i. e.* as titular bishops) for the more speedy administration of the sacraments, and other good, wholesome and devout things, and laudable ceremonies, to the increase of God's honor, and for the commodity of good and devout people, it is enacted that the towns of Thetford, etc., shall be taken and accepted for sees of bishop's suffragans.

"And every archbishop and bishop, being disposed to have any suffragan, shall name two honest and discreet spiritual persons, being learned and of good conversation, and present them to the king by writing, under their seals, making humble request to his majesty, to give to one such of the said two persons as shall please his majesty, such title, name, stile, and dignity of bishop of such of the sees above specified, as he shall think most convenient, so it be within the province whereof the bishop that doth name him is. And he shall be called bishop suffragan of the same see.

"And after such title, stile, and name so given, the king shall present him by his letters patent under the great seal, to the archbishop of the province, requiring him to consecrate the said person, and to give him such other benedictions and ceremonies, as to the degree and office of a bishop suffragan shall be requisite.

"And the bishop that shall nominate the suffragan, or the suffragan himself that shall be nominate, shall provide two bishops or suffragans to consecrate him with the archbishop, and shall bear their reasonable costs.

"And the archbishop, having no lawful impediment, shall consecrate such suffragan within three months next after the letters patent shall come to his hands.

"And the person so consecrated shall have such capacity, power, authority, and reputation, concerning the execution of such commission as by any of the said archbishops or bishops within their diocese shall be given to the said suffragans, as to suffragans of this realm heretofore hath been used and accustomed.

"No such suffragans shall take any profits of the place and sees whereof they shall be named, nor have or use any jurisdiction or episcopal authority within the said sees; nor within any diocese or place, but only such profits, jurisdiction, and authority as shall be licensed to them by any archbishop or bishop within their diocese, to whom they shall be suffragans by commission under their seals. . . . And no suffragan shall use any jurisdiction ordinary, or episcopal power, otherwise, nor longer time than shall be limited by such commission, on pain of a præmunire.

"And the residence of him that shall be suffragan over the diocese where he shall have commission, shall serve him for residence as sufficiently as if he were resident upon any other his benefice.

"And such suffragan, exercising the said office, by such commission as aforesaid, for the better maintenance of his dignity may have two benefices with cure." — Burn's *Ecd. Law*, art. Bishop.

² Strype, *Cranmer*, App. xxi.

vestments, and other ornaments of the Church ; to suspend and reconcile places and Churches ; to consecrate Churches and altars, to confer the minor Orders ; to consecrate holy oil of chrism and unction, and to perform all other things belonging to the office of a Bishop, until the revocation of this commission." It does not appear that the full number of twenty-six Suffragans was ever consecrated. Strype finds but eleven consecrations in the Archiepiscopal Register in Cranmer's time, and a few in Parker's time, but observes that there may have been others not recorded there.¹

In 1641 Archbishop Usher proposed a plan for the establishment of a Suffragan Bishop in every Archdeanery. It was the fruit of Usher's real knowledge of the organization of the Primitive Church, combined with his loose notions concerning the rights of the Presbyterian party ; and, as it was offered, is fitly characterized by a writer of the next generation, as "a plan for a mongrel Church government. A mule begotten by Presbyterianism upon

¹ We have compiled the following list from Strype and other sources :—

1. 1536. Thomas Mann, Ipswich, Diocese of Norwich.
2. 1536. John Salisbury,¹ Thetford, Diocese of Norwich.
3. 1536. William Moore, Colchester, Diocese of Rochester.²
4. 1537. Hy. Holbeach, Bristol.³
5. 1537. John Bird,⁴ Penrick.⁵
6. 1537. Lewis Thomas, Salop.⁶
7. 1537. Thomas Morley, Marlborough, Diocese of York.
8. 1537. Richard Ungworth, Dover, Diocese of Canterbury.
9. 1537. John Hodgkin,⁷ Bedford, Diocese of Ely.
10. 1537. Robert Sylvester, Hull, Diocese of York.
11. 1538. William Finch, Taunton, Diocese of Bath and Wells.
12. 1538. John Bradley, Shaftesbury, Diocese of Salisbury.
13. — Richard Thomden,⁸ Dover, Diocese of Canterbury.
14. 1566. R. Barnes,⁹ Nottingham, Diocese of Lincoln.¹⁰
15. 1569. R. Rogers,¹¹ Dover, Diocese of Canterbury.
16. 1590. — — —¹² Colchester, Diocese of Rochester.¹³
17. 1605. — Stern,¹⁴ Colchester, Diocese of Rochester.

Doubtless a careful search might increase this list considerably.

¹ Dean of Norwich 1539. Deprived 1558-54 ; Restored 1560 ; Trans. Sodor and Man 1571, but held his deanery till his death.

² Colchester belonged to London, but the Suffragan seems always to have served Rochester.

³ Erected into a Diocese 1542.

⁴ Translated to Bangor 1539.

⁵ Attached to Landaff.

⁶ Quere ?

⁷ One of the consecrators of Archbishop Parker.

⁸ His name stands at the head of the list of Prebendaries of Canterbury, circ. 1548.

⁹ Chancellor of York 1569 ; Tr. to Carlisle 1570, to Durham 1577.

¹⁰ Nottingham belongs to York, but this Suffragan served Lincoln.

¹¹ Prebend of Canterbury 1569.

¹² Mentioned by his title in Burnet's *Life of Bishop Bedell*, p. 2.

¹³ Belongs to London See note 2.

¹⁴ Suspended for not appearing in Convocation, 1605.

Episcopacy." "The things which the Presbyterians of that day chiefly excepted to in the English hierarchy were *the great extent of the Bishops' Dioceses*; their deputing commissaries, chancellors, and officials to act in their stead; their assuming the sole power of ordination and jurisdiction, and acting so arbitrarily in visitation articles."

The committee of the House of Commons appointed to wait upon Charles II. at the Hague, was accompanied by eight or ten of the Presbyterian Divines, who, at a public audience had with the King, professed themselves no enemies of a moderate Episcopacy, and proposed Usher's plan as the ground-work of an accommodation.

The reason why it pleased them so well was that it took all jurisdiction out of the hands of the Bishops, and conferred it upon Synods, with an appeal from the monthly Synods of the Suffragans, to the semi-annual or annual Synods of the Diocesans, and thence to the triennial Synods of the Provinces.

About the same time, Williams, Archbishop of York, introduced into the Upper House a plan "for the regulation of Bishops and their jurisdiction," which provided that "every Bishop should have twelve assistants for jurisdiction and ordination," four of whom were to be chosen by the King, four by the Lords, and four by the Commons. The bill does not even specify that these *assistants* shall be spiritual persons. It never passed to a second reading. But the House of Commons, that same session, passed a bill by which every shire town was "to be a several Diocese, with a Presbytery of twelve Divines, and a President or Bishop over them, who, with them, should have charge of all matters of orders and jurisdiction."¹

October 25, 1660, Charles II. set forth his Declaration to all his loving subjects concerning Ecclesiastical affairs, the second Article of which promises the restoration of Suffragans.² This promise was never fulfilled, and by this time the very name of "Suffragan" had become so identified with Presbyterian factiousness that

¹ Archbishop Williams' bill had a clause "that no Bishop shall be Justice of Peace, excepting the Dean of Westminster, in Westminster and St. Martins." "Here the Bishop hedged in a little privilege for himself, for he was then Dean of Westminster." Collier, II. 805.

² "Because the Dioceses, especially some of them, are thought to be of too large extent, we will appoint such a number of Suffragan Bishops as shall be sufficient for the due performance of their work."

it was a stench in the nostrils of all sound churchmen. The non-juring Bishops helped to confirm this prejudice, by consecrating Suffragans to the principal Sees by way of keeping up their own succession. Thetford and Ipswich were thus filled for nigh a hundred years.¹ We come now to the history of Assistants and Suffragans in the American Church.

The question first arose in the Diocese of New York, upon the resignation of Bishop Provoost in 1801. This resignation was accepted by the New York Convention, which proceeded to elect Dr. Moore as Diocesan. But the House of Bishops refused to entertain Bishop Provoost's resignation, offering, at the same time, to consecrate any suitable person as Assistant or Coadjutor Bishop for the Diocese. This the Diocese refused to concede. But Dr. Moore was consecrated, being regarded by the House of Bishops as an Assistant Bishop, and by the Diocese of New York as Diocesan, until the death of Bishop Provoost in 1815. But before this latter event, Bishop Moore was stricken with paralysis, in 1810, and the Diocese proceeded to elect Dr. Hobart Assistant Bishop. Dr. Hobart was consecrated in May, 1811, and, thus, from 1811 to 1815, New York had three Bishops, all competent, in the opinion of the House of Bishops, to exercise jurisdiction within the Diocese. The grave complications which threatened to arise out of this anomalous state of things, were averted by the death of Bishop Provoost, in 1815, followed, in 1816, by that of Bishop Moore, when Dr. Hobart succeeded as Diocesan.

In 1812, Bishop Claggett, of Maryland, appealed to his Convention to supply him with a Suffragan. "The Church had then no law on the subject of Assistant Bishops, and though there were some few instances of such officers in the early history of the Church, yet was the Ecclesiastical usage of primitive times but imperfectly understood by many who discoursed very fluently, if not very wisely, of Chorepiscopi, Coadjutors, and Suffragans. What the majority of the clergy wishes, it would be now difficult to say. We are at no loss, however, as to the desire of the Bishop.

¹ As late as 1741 we read of one Dr. Blackburn, "He afterwards showed me the commission of his consecration. Upon this, I begged his blessing, which he gave me with the fervor and zeal of a primitive Bishop. I asked of him if I was so happy as to belong to his Diocese? 'Dear friend,' said he, 'we leave the Sees open, that the gentlemen who now unjustly possess them, upon the restoration, may, if they please, return to their duty and be continued. We content ourselves with full Episcopal power as Suffragans.'" Nichols, quoted by Lathbury, *Hist. Non Jurors*, p. 395. London, 1845.

In his letter to the Convention of 1812 he says, after remarking that it is a momentous question, 'There are two kinds of Assistant Bishops mentioned by Ecclesiastical writers. The one is called a Coadjutor, the other a Suffragan. The powers of these as contradistinguished and defined by Bishop Gibson in his Code, and by other writers, are said to consist in this, that the Coadjutor hath an authority in the Diocese independent of the Bishop, while the Suffragan's jurisdiction is limited, both in extent and degree, by the paramount authority of the Bishop of the Diocese. The former kind was never meditated by me, and will be strenuously opposed. . . . An Assistant Bishop of the Suffragan description is the only one that I shall be able conscientiously to accept.'"¹

Some doubt of the constitutionality of complying with the Bishop's recommendation arose from the circumstance that the Constitution spoke only of a Bishop of Maryland. But the Convention finally resolved to proceed at once to the election of a Suffragan. Dr. Kemp, then *2d Rector* (associate R.) of St. Paul's, Baltimore, was elected by the clergy, but the election failed at that time by the non-concurrence of the laity, and the question was laid over to the next Convention. Meanwhile party spirit ran very high in the Diocese. How high, may be judged from the fact that in the next Convention a proposition was seriously debated, looking to the recognition of non-Episcopal ordinations. The Convention of 1813 adjourned without electing a Bishop. But in 1814, the accident of war made it well nigh impossible to visit the "Eastern Shore," and the Bishop, apparently despairing of obtaining the relief he had asked, proposed the revival of an old Canon authorizing the Bishop to call in some of his Presbyters to assist him in the work of visitation. This seems to have brought matters to a conclusion; and among the last acts of the Convention of 1814, was the election of Dr. Kemp as Suffragan Bishop, by a vote of, clergy — ayes 9, noes 8; laity — ayes 18, noes 7. The "two thirds of both orders" rule which defeated the same election in 1812, having been suspended or canceled for the occasion.

The opposition which was afterwards made to the consecration of Dr. Kemp, was so evidently factious and partisan in its character, that the consecrating Bishops refused to entertain it, and Dr. Kemp was consecrated, and assigned by Bishop Claggett to

¹ Hawks' *Eccl. Con.* in loco.

the District of the Eastern Shore. The account of the disgraceful proceedings of Dashiell and others opposed to Dr. Kemp, and their application to Dr. Provoost to aid them in establishing a schismatical communion, may be found in Hawks' "Ecclesiastical Contributions." We mention them here to indicate that the outcry was not raised against the "*Suffragan*," but against the Rector of St. Paul's, a staunch churchman. In 1815, Bishop Kemp's election was reaffirmed by the Convention, and the right of succession as Diocesan was secured to him, and accordingly in 1817, Bishop Kemp became the Diocesan upon the death of Bishop Claggett.

In 1828, Bishop Moore of Virginia asked the Convention of that Diocese for an assistant or Suffragan. The Constitution of the Diocese expressly declared that there should be but one Bishop of Virginia. A committee, to whom the matter was referred, reported in favor of altering the Constitution, which recommendation, lying over one year, was adopted in 1829, by a vote of 50 to 30. It was thus (1829) "*Resolved*, That this Convention deem it expedient, considering the age and bodily infirmity of our Most Venerated Bishop, to proceed to the election of an Assistant Bishop, who is not to be considered as entitled to the succession, but that it shall be the right and duty of the Convention of the Diocese of Virginia, upon the demise of our venerated Bishop, to proceed to the election of a principal Bishop, as successor to said deceased Bishop."

Under this resolution Dr. Meade was elected Assistant Bishop, and the delegates from Virginia were instructed to bring the matter before the General Convention of that year.

The clause barring Dr. Meade's succession as Diocesan, occasioned a hot debate in the Lower House, which, however, finally yielded the point, as not provided for by any existing legislation. The House of Bishops concurred, with a protest against making the case a precedent, and with the expression of its opinion that the Diocese would eventually raise no objection to Bishop Meade's succession as Diocesan. Canon V. of 1829 was then passed, defining the office of an Assistant Bishop, and prohibiting Suffragans. In 1831 Bishop Meade quietly succeeded Bishop Moore, who died that year.

In 1847, Dr. Hugh Davey Evans introduced into the General Convention a *proposed* canon entitled "Of Suffragan Bishops." This canon labored under the disadvantage of all special legisla-

tion, that it looked too exclusively to the necessities and exigencies of a particular Diocese, — New York, whose Bishop was then under a judicial sentence. It was offered as a substitute for a wholesale amendment of all the canons bearing upon the case of New York, amendments numbering nearly forty.¹ The Committee on Canons reported, that "They deem the provisions of the canon reported by them, entitled 'Of Suffragan Bishops,' sufficient to meet all the necessities of the case contemplated by the (amendatory) resolution, and recommend that it is inexpedient to make the amendments proposed." The Committee on Canons that year was composed of the Rev. Drs. S. F. Jarvis, Mead, Hawks, and Forbes, and the Rev. J. P. McGuire, with Messrs. H. D. Evans, E. F. Chambers, Samuel Jones, and Jos. R. Ingersoll, who thus gave their weighty voices in favor of the Suffragan principle.²

¹ Journal, p. 65.

² The canon of H. D. Evans, Esq., is as follows: "Of Suffragan Bishops." 1. "It shall be lawful for the Convention of any Diocese of this Church, with the consent of the Bishop of such Diocese, if he be able to give such consent, or, without it, in case of his disability to give the same, to elect, agreeably to such rules as shall be fixed by the Convention of such Diocese, one or more Suffragan Bishops, provided that if there be one or more Suffragan Bishops in any Diocese, the Bishop of which is under a disability to give such consent, no such election shall take place."

2. Provides for the manner of certifying the election of Suffragans and their consecration.

3. "No Suffragan Bishop shall ever be elected in any Diocese in the interval between the death or resignation of one Diocesan and the consecration of another; and no Suffragan shall be consecrated unless by the Bishop of the Diocese for which he has been elected, or with his consent. Provided that, if the Bishop of such Diocese shall not be able to give his consent, and evidence of that fact be produced satisfactory to the consecrating Bishops, they may proceed to the consecration."

4. "No Suffragan Bishop, elected and consecrated agreeably to the provisions of this Canon, shall have any jurisdiction except within the District allotted to him; but every such Suffragan shall perform all such Episcopal offices, and within such District, or portion of the Diocese as the Diocesan may from time to time direct. But if the Diocesan should be unable to perform any portion of the duty, and be unwilling or unable to give any such direction, or the Diocese should become vacant, and there should be but one Suffragan Bishop within any such Diocese, then such Suffragan shall perform all Episcopal offices which may be required within such Diocese; or, if there should be more than one, each of them shall perform such Episcopal offices as may be required, within the District previously assigned him. And they shall, among them, make such provision for the remaining part of the Diocese, as they may be able to agree upon, and if they cannot agree, the Standing Committee may request any Diocesan Bishop of this Church to divide the Diocese among them."

5. "No Suffragan Bishop shall, by virtue of his election and consecration, be entitled to a vote or seat in the House of Bishops, or to become Diocesan Bishop of any Diocese, nor shall his consent be necessary to the consecration of any Bishop or Suffragan Bishop. But every Suffragan Bishop shall be entitled to a vote and seat in the Convention of his own Diocese; and, in case the Bishop of any Diocese shall not be present at the Convention of his Diocese, a Suffragan Bishop, if one or more be present, shall preside."

6. "No Suffragan Bishop shall ordain any priest or deacon, without the direction in

The proposed canon was referred to a joint committee of the two houses to report at the next Convention. The committee never reported. The case of New York was disposed of in 1850, by the canon "Of the Election of a Provisional Bishop," and no one seems to have had sufficient interest in the general principle involved in the proposed canon to call for the report, if there were any report in readiness.

In the Convention of 1856, Bishop Whittingham proposed an amendment to Article V. of the Constitution, looking to an increase of the Episcopate, without increasing the number of Diocesan delegations, or of Bishops having votes in the Upper House. The amendment appears to have been offered as a compromise to enable those of the Bishops who objected to such an increase of the legislature of the Church, but did not object to an increase of the number of *working Bishops*, to respond favorably to the repeated call of the Lower House for increased facilities for dividing Dioceses.¹

In the Convention of Maryland, 1859, Dr. Kerfoot offered a resolution, "That the attention of the General Convention be respectfully requested to the plan which had been proposed to that body (in 1856) by the Bishop of Maryland, for the amendment of

writing of the Diocesan Bishop to whose Diocese such priest or deacon shall belong, except that, during the vacancy of a Diocese, or the disability of the Diocesan to give such directions in writing, the Suffragan or Suffragans of such Diocese may ordain priests and deacons, if requested to do so by the Convention of the Diocese, or, in its recess, by the Standing Committee. But every Suffragan Bishop may assist at the consecration of any Bishop at which he may be invited to assist by the Bishop presiding at such consecration."

7. "Any Suffragan Bishop may be elected Bishop of any vacant Diocese." The remainder of this section details the mode of certifying and confirming such elections and translations.

8. "No Diocese, having one or more Suffragan Bishops, shall be at liberty to call in a Provisional Bishop."

9. Repeals Canon II. 1832.

¹ Abstract of the proposed amendment. "A new Diocese may be formed within any existing Diocese, on the proposal of the Bishop of the same, by the vote of two-thirds of the Diocesan Convention, at two successive Conventions, with an interval of at least one year: provided that such Diocese shall be entitled only to elect a Bishop, agreeably to the provisions of the Constitutions and Canons of this Church, who shall have exclusive Diocesan jurisdiction therein, but shall proceed no further in Diocesan organization, unless admitted into union by the General Convention, being otherwise included, for all Diocesan purposes, in the Diocese in union, out of which it shall have been formed."

"The Bishop of a Diocese, not admitted to union with the General Convention, shall be eligible on the occurrence of a vacancy in the Episcopate of the Diocese in union with which his Diocese may be connected, but unless and until so elected, shall have only a seat and deliberative voice in the House of Bishops, but no vote."

The other amendatory clauses not being particularly german to our subject are omitted. Journal, 1856, p. 205.

Article V. of the Constitution." The resolution was laid on the table, not, apparently, from any dislike to it, on the part of the Convention, but because it became entangled in a snarl of Parliamentary tactics, which the Convention despaired of unraveling.

When the amendment came up in the General Convention of 1859, in due course, it was referred to Bishops Elliott, Johns, and Upfold, as the Committee on Amendments, who reported that "In the opinion of this committee the time must soon come when the Church will have to meet the question of smaller Dioceses, and an enlarged Episcopate. That the plan proposed by the Bishop of Maryland is in contravention of the established policy of this Church, which has always been jealous of an Episcopate not strictly Diocesan, as evidenced by her stringent provisions touching Missionary Bishops, her unwillingness to grant Assistant Bishops except in the last emergency, her prohibition of Suffragan Bishops, and of more than one Assistant Bishop at a time in a Diocese. And the committee, therefore, recommend that the proposed amendment be laid on the table ;" which was carried.

We have been at some pains to furnish our readers with the historical facts illustrating the question of Suffragan Bishops. Perhaps they will kindly bear with us if we briefly add our own very unimportant conclusions and inferences by way of "opening the debate."

The essence of the Suffraganate is, manifestly, not a matter of Orders, but of jurisdiction or mission. The propriety of restricting Episcopal mission was conceded when Diocesan Episcopacy was begun with St. James, St. Timothy, St. Titus, and St. John. Instead of "Go ye into all the world," the Church said to the individual Bishop, "Go thou into such a place," and censured him if he stepped beyond his measure. It was conceded when SS. Silas and Timothy served in the Apostolate in subjection to St. Paul. They, being Bishops, went and did, where and what it was delegated to them by St. Paul. It was conceded also when the provincial system was established, *always*, in so far as to restrain Diocesan Bishops from consecrating *Bishops* without their Metropolitan, and *often*, in respect of less important Episcopal functions. To this day, wherever ancient customs prevail, a Metropolitan visiting any of the Dioceses of his Province, may inhibit the Diocesan from all Episcopal functions during the visitation. And, lastly, the American Church has conceded the same thing in

permitting Assistant Bishops, who exercise no jurisdiction whatever, except by delegation from their Diocesans. It only remains, therefore, to discuss the point whether it is better to have District Bishops, *i. e.* Assistants having a restricted *local* jurisdiction, or our present system of Coadjutor Bishops, who are consoled for their lack of local habitation and name by the hope of succession as Diocesans.

We have seen that when St. Paul exercised his mission at large, having "the care of all the Churches," he had his Suffragans at large, Silas and Timothy. We have seen Rabanus claiming that when SS. Peter and Paul abode in Rome, they had their Suffragans, Linus and Clemens, with them there. We have seen, also, that before the close of the third century, that is, as soon as the necessity for such Bishops could have become general, an order of District Bishops, called *Chorepiscopi*, and answering to our definition of a Diocesan's Suffragan, had become so common, as to be recognized as an established order by the great Councils. If it be urged that this order was a mark of degeneracy, and "a sign of the growing ambition of the city Prelates, encroaching upon the rights of their weaker brethren," we reply that the charge is wholly gratuitous, and no better than that which we laugh to scorn when the Presbyterian urges that Diocesan Episcopacy arose out of the ambition of city Presbyters. Damasus, in the middle of the fourth century, could not tell from whence the *Chorepiscopi* sprang. The Council of Nice, a general council summoned expressly to reduce the Church to primitive order, had not a word of cavil against the existence of the *Chorepiscopi*, nor dreamed of denouncing them as an innovation. Prior to the recognition of the Church by the State, there was nothing to tempt the city Prelates to such encroachments. Being only spiritual persons, without temporal dignity or authority, they could hardly be jealous of their weaker brethren in the rural districts; and, coming down to the hard facts, we find that the *Chorepiscopi* flourished everywhere until the Councils of Nice and Antioch, and were first denounced by the Council of Laodicea, after a lapse of years, just about sufficient to allow the leaven of temporal pride to affect the Episcopate. And that, while it is only a bold guess to say that the *Chorepiscopi* had their *origin* in the ambition of the city Prelate, it is a notorious fact that they got their death in the ambition of the Bishop of Rome, whose favorite device and fondest hope was

to supplant them everywhere by Assistant Bishops, Coadjutors. It is curious to note that our American Dioceses, which are most fond of the Coadjutor system, are the very ones which hold Rome in the greatest traditional *disesteem*! We find also, that *Chorepiscopi*, or District Bishops, lingered in England (and, if the facts could be ascertained, we might find that they flourished there) until the incoming of the Normans, and the extension of the Papacy over the English Church — that one of the first acts of the Reformation was to revive the order in its true primitive form — that this good purpose had but a partial accomplishment, because of the rapacity of the King in appropriating to his own use the Abbey revenues, on which Cranmer relied for the multiplication of Sees, and in a secondary way, by multiplying Chapter dignities, for the support of his *Chorepiscopi* — that the whole system of Suffragans fell into disrepute by reason of the factiousness of the Presbyterians — that, notwithstanding the general prejudice, such a writer as Bingham urged the restoration of Cranmer's Suffragans as an alternative, if the Sees could not be multiplied — that we have actually had a *Chorepiscopus* and Suffragan in the American Church, in Dr. Kemp, and no harm done — that such American canonists and churchmen as Hawks, Jarvis, Meade, Evans, Chambers, and others, have approved the office, either upon general principles, or as a safe expedient in special emergencies — and that Dr. Hawks accuses the churchmen of 1829 of legislating against Suffragans without knowing what a Suffragan is. We do not think it necessary to set against this array of facts, the arguments in favor of Assistant Bishops. The order is fast dying out, and another quarter century will probably see the last of it. We call the attention of churchmen to the Suffragan system in its room. The restrictions laid upon the Suffragans may vary in every Diocese without affecting the unity of the Church. It is a strictly Diocesan affair. Some restrictions there must be, or the Suffragan becomes a Diocesan. Some independence within his own District there must be, or he becomes a cipher, "a Bishop's glove." What the restrictions shall be may be safely left to Diocesan experiment, the General Convention first marking out a maximum and a minimum of Suffragan independence.

It is manifest that we cannot reproduce in this land and age the exact copy of the primitive discipline, any more than we can reproduce the civil polity out of which it grew. We object to mak-

ing American Suffragans utterly dependent on the caprice of their Diocesans. We see no difficulty in securing to them, as Bishops, their seat and deliberative voice, perhaps also a vote, in the General Council. We would invest them with the visitatorial powers of an English Archdeacon, at least; and, placing a Suffragan at the head of every extensive Convocation, would nip in the bud the Rural Deanery system just beginning to appear among us. We would refuse them all right of succession as Diocesans in their own Diocese, except by special election and confirmation, that they may have the same life-interest in their districts that a Diocesan has in his Diocese. We would refuse them the power of convoking conciliary legislation, because the fewer ecclesiastical legislatures we have, the better; the American Church and State are being legislated into anarchy. And we would refuse them the right to confer Holy Orders without their Diocesans, because the passage to the ministry cannot be too jealously guarded, and we have constant evidence of what the dearth of *candidates* induces even the Diocesans to do in the way of giving orders "*suddenly*" already.

And here we might leave the subject, but we feel that if this were the only conclusion we aimed at, we might never have begun our task. There is a more serious consideration which we desire, with humility, to lay before the Church, namely: "Whether the Suffragan system is now a safer expedient at this juncture of affairs than the 'subdivision' plan, which is so rapidly rising into favor?" We propound the query as a *query*, and not as a proposition of which we propose to maintain the affirmative. We do it in advance of the necessity, for we are well assured that subdivision may safely go on a great way farther than it has yet been even *contemplated* by the Church *at large*. And yet, not wholly in advance of the necessity, for there are many Dioceses which cannot safely be subdivided, which yet need more Bishops, and many Districts which the commonest prudence debars from isolation as separate Dioceses, which yet might find in a Suffragan the very element of vigorous growth, which they need.

We are confessedly *experimenting* upon the best mode of adapting our branch of the Holy Catholic Church, to the wants of a new and peculiar population. The difference between a Suffragan experiment and a Diocesan experiment, is just here: that a Diocese requires *organization*, and an organization is not easily destroyed. The worst *heresies* (we beg pardon for using such an

illustration) are manageable as long as they continue in the Church, but once organized, they are indestructible, except by natural decay, of which they carry the seeds within themselves. The Suffraganate established in any Diocese, would be at the control of the Diocese; it could be abolished at the death of any incumbent, by the Diocesan Convention. The abolition of a Diocese, an integral part of the National Church, must necessarily involve the whole Church in its consummation, and might easily bring a Diocese into collision with the National Council.

Again, we are evidently nearing an epoch when we must establish some *adequate, natural*, and uniform mode of increasing the Episcopate. Thus far the Church has been jealous of everything but a strictly Diocesan Episcopacy, with how much justice, we have endeavored to show. Her Assistant Bishops are Diocesans expectant. And experience has proved that we are constantly liable to emergencies requiring special legislation. If we had had a provision for Bishops *in partibus*, or for Suffragans during the long interregnum in New York, how easily might the Diocese have found relief during the suspension of her Diocesan, without resorting to that questionable device of a Provisional Bishop. It is true, and we rejoice in the fact, that the present tendency of the Church is toward a comprehensive and finally adequate policy, in the growing favor which is shown to the See principle and the Provincial system. But we see how *State lines* and State patriotism are hindering this movement, and we see no escape at present from this hindrance, except by providing some alternative to subdivision, which will fall in with the general scope of the Provincial system. The Suffraganate, so far from being hostile to the Provincial system and the See principle, is eminently congruous and conducive to them both. Suffragan Bishops will smooth the way for new Dioceses. A Suffragan Bishop, with his Convocation, is simply a Diocesan in *posse*, and not even "in embryo," as Bishop Whittingham's plan of 1856 would make him, yet ready to spring, like Minerva from the brain of Jupiter, into full life and vigor at any moment. If the present wholesome agitation for "division" becomes a "rage," Dioceses may spring up with great rapidity, but rather with the stability of the mushroom than of the Minerva. It is the dread of hasty action in a matter fraught with such inestimable consequences, that causes the best friend of "division" to accept every defeat and discouragement with calmness

and composure, assured that God is teaching His Church wisdom by experience.

Nor may it be out of place to notice how the Suffragan system, while it harmonizes with the hopes of those who are eager for "division," avoids the objections that are now constantly and efficiently urged by the opponents of subdivision of Dioceses.

1. It avoids the *money question*. We have little sympathy with the spirit that meets every mooted question with an intolerant sneer, as though it must always spring out of low and ignoble thoughts of Christ and His promise. We believe that whenever division is necessary, God will provide by raising up means and instruments; and we would divide our own Diocese to-morrow, if it lay with us, without a thought of "wherewithal shall we be" supported. But we give our more *prudent* brethren credit for sincerity when they shrink from the financial *risk*, and ask to see the figures. We are even willing to let them overstate the figures, and are confident of beating them in a fair fight then. Perhaps some "anti-division men" do "consider their pockets" too prudently. And perhaps some "division men" are "*seeking a mitre*." But we take it the vast majority on either side desires nothing so much as the best good of the Church, and the glory of God.

Now a Suffragan, with a Deacon or two, can hold a Parish as well as not. His District would have no charge upon it but for his Episcopal expenses, and the pay of his Deacon. As his District grows under his hand, its ability and willingness will increase. Let it provide him first with a Priest assistant; afterwards let it relieve him entirely from Parish work, and either remain indefinitely a District, preserving the integrity of the original Diocese as long as may be desired, or set up for itself as an independent Diocese. Meanwhile, around the Suffragan's Church would have grown up the schools, hospitals, and asylums, which no Presbyter can establish in his single Parish.

Or, if the District be a missionary field, like Western Maryland, Western Virginia, Eastern Connecticut, and a score of others that we could mention, let the Suffragan establish himself as the head of an associate mission, and evangelize by itinerating with his Deacons, supported meanwhile by the Diocesan Missionary Fund. The \$2,500 or \$3,000 which Connecticut now spends upon Eastern Connecticut, would, with the offertories of the missions, sustain a

Suffragan in Willimantic, Norwich, or New London, with his staff of Deacons, and with some fruit to show. But it is folly to talk of making Eastern Connecticut an independent Diocese at present.

2. It avoids the peril of hasty subdivision, as already noticed.

3. It preserves the unity of the original Dioceses, until men have learned what a Bishop is, and have been educated to prefer Episcopacy to State lines.

4. It avoids the peril of "small Bishops" alleged against small Dioceses. For while second and third rate men might often be made Suffragans, it is better that they should be Suffragans than Diocesans. They will do less harm by their incompetency in the inferior and subordinate offices.

5. It gives the Church a stock of tried material, out of which she may create her Diocesans, and gradually elevate the standard of her Episcopate. The Suffragan, who has approved himself in his lesser sphere, by faithfulness and executive ability, is a safer person to trust at the head of a Diocese than the untried Presbyterian. So keenly is this felt, that it is almost passed into a proverb, that "Many a good parish Priest is spoiled to make a poor Bishop."

6. It saves the constitutional requirement of forty-five self-supporting Parishes, as a condition precedent to division. Ordinarily fifteen Parishes are few enough to organize into a new Diocese. We doubt the propriety of altering that requirement. Give any such Diocese the privilege of choosing a Suffragan to supply its necessities, and let him stir up the gift of God that is in him until he gets his fifteen Parishes or fifty. If he cannot do it, *ceteris paribus*, a Diocesan could not.

And here we pause and await the judgment of our betters. If we have done anything to facilitate the solution of the mighty problem which God has given the American Church to solve, "*Laus Deo.*" If otherwise, and we have spent ourselves in vain, "*Judica me, Domine.*"

ART. V.—RITUALISM, AND THE INFLUENCE OF THE JUDGMENT OF THE JUDICIAL COMMITTEE.

THE decision of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in the case of the Rev. Mr. Mackonochie must be of influence in every portion of Christendom which has sprung from the English

Church, and possesses a book of Common Prayer, modeled upon her own. That influence will be great upon the questions directly involved, which may also arise in all Churches of her lineage; but it must be far greater, from the principles of decision and construction so unequivocally declared, and of such comprehensiveness and truth.

But before examining the judgment itself, let an objection from the composition of the tribunal pronouncing it receive attention.

The exercise of ultimate jurisdiction in matters ecclesiastical, by a body of men, a majority of whom are laymen, and may not be churchmen, had its origin in the Statute of 37 Henry VIII. chap. 17, "A bill that Doctors of the Civil Law, being married, may exercise ecclesiastical jurisdiction."

For a long series of years, the evils of such a principle were little felt in practice, and were disregarded. The attention and energy of the restored Anglican Church was long absorbed in her contest with Ritualism on the one side, and Romanism on the other. The triumph of the former laid her prostrate from 1649 to 1660. Then came the extravagance of passive obedience, and the dissolute irreligion of the Restoration. Then the indifference and apathy, the feeble Catholicism, and thorough Erastianism of the succeeding period. And besides, few occasions arose when the questions were so prominent in their character, or so extensively agitated, as to awaken attention.

But within the last quarter of a century decisions have been made which effectually broke this slumber, and aroused the churchmen of England to ponder upon the solecism and peril of their position. The judgments in the Gorham case, and upon certain portions of the Essays and Reviews, shocked the Orthodoxy of England as to points of Faith, and developed the evil composition of a tribunal, in which power so great as to doctrines forming the life of the Church, could be exercised.

There are few passages in any writings which exceed, in a grave and impressive eloquence, the first six pages of Dr. Pusey's work, "The Councils of the Church."¹ The struggle of a mind imbued with profound loyalty to the State, but a deeper devotional loyalty to the Church, is strikingly visible. He speaks of a Parliament composed perhaps of persons of no definite religious faith legislating for the Church, and exclaims: "She endures it until injustice shall make it intolerable, or justice shall amend it."

¹ Oxford, 1857.

Concurring fully in this condemnation, and rejoicing that our own Church is exempt from the evil, we find a marked difference as to the judgment now considered, which removes this objection effectually, and leaves to it all the weight which the ability, learning, and judicial habits of those who pronounced it, may deserve.

The question in the case was not one of Doctrine or of Faith. It was, whether certain practices in the celebration of Divine service were warranted, or illegal? And this question was to be solved by the just construction of rubrics, statutes, and documents of various kinds. Contemporaneous writings of Divines and usage were also to be regarded, whenever ambiguity existed in authoritative formularies.

That many if not all of such practices had been adopted, because they were deemed symbolical of a tenet of faith, does not touch the question judicially, nor vary the mode of solving it.¹ It would be immaterial, that a judge held to a real presence up to the highest point of transubstantiation. He yet would be bound to hold, that the law of the Church inhibited a practice however expressive of the doctrine.

For such a question, to be so determined, a tribunal, consisting of the chiefs of the great English Courts, of the Archbishops, or Bishops, of former Lord Chancellors, and Barons of the Exchequer, must strike a lawyer at least, as unapproached by anything else known in the judicial world, for talent, learning, habits of profound examination, and presumptive integrity of judgment. Again, we are justified in concluding that the Court was unanimous. Beside the evidence from the omission of any recorded dissent, the statements upon the point in English journals settle the question.

There is one point in the letter of Dr. Pusey to the "London Times," which requires notice. If accurate, it would somewhat lessen the value of the opinion. He allows, with his usual fairness, that it would do no more. He observes, that the judgment runs thus: "In the Rubric, as to the reception of the sacramental bread and wine, the words 'all meekly kneeling' apply to the celebrant as well as to other clerks and to the people." He then cites the Rubric of the Book of Charles II. Our own is exactly the same, the word "Priest" being substituted in ours for

¹ Dr. Pusey admits this; letter to the *London Times*, Dec. 26, 1868. *Church Journal*, N. Y., January 13, 1869.

"Minister," and "devoutly" for "meekly." He adds: "Now, if this clause 'all meekly kneeling' applies at all to the celebrant, it would grammatically involve the direction that he should kneel while administering to others." He proceeds to state as a conclusion among others, that really the judgment rests upon this error.

The whole matter appears to be exceedingly plain. The charge against the accused was, of prostrating or kneeling, during or after the consecration prayer. No evidence was given of a kneeling after the prayer was ended, and before reception. The evidence was, of kneeling or prostrating at intervals during the prayer.

Now the prescribed course is plain. The Priest is directed to say the prayer "We do not presume to come," etc., kneeling. Then he is expressly directed to stand before the table. The consecration is to be made standing. The decision is explicit, that a posture once directed must be continued, until a change is authorized.¹ When the consecration is finished, we have a direction for a hymn, and then in our own and in the English book is the Rubric as to the reception by himself, and delivery of the elements, in which the words "all devoutly kneeling" occur.

The judgment is, and most plainly, that as there is no permission to kneel during the consecration, so there is none in the interval between its close and the reception by the Priest. Then the words as to kneeling apply distributively to the Minister at the time of his reception, and to the people when they receive. And as he is to proceed to deliver the elements to others, into their hands, the direction to stand up after his own reception, becomes a necessary inference.

The result seems clear that the Court was right, and Dr. Pusey in error.

The next inquiry is, what has been absolutely and in terms adjudged by this and the previous case of *Liddell vs. Westerton*, the principles of which are reaffirmed.

1. That the term "ornaments of the Church" used in the 25th Section of the Statute 1 Elizabeth, and in the Rubric of the Prayer Book of Charles II., sanctioned by the Act of Uniformity, means the articles (*Instrumenta*) employed in the public services of the Church. They are distinct from architectural or decorative ornamentation. The ornaments of the Ministers are vestments.

¹ Dr. Wheatly. Whenever the Church does not direct the Minister to kneel, it supposes him to stand. Page 300. The change may be by express direction, or plain inference.

2. That those ornaments of the Church are lawful, and those only, which are prescribed in terms, or sanctioned in terms, by the first Prayer Book of Edward VI. ; or by a warrantable inference are sanctioned as accessory to what is prescribed.

3. As to *Crucifixes*, the law so plainly forbid them, that discussion was useless.

4. As to Crosses, that if attached to the Communion Table, or standing on it, they were unlawful ; but if placed in other parts of the Church, as upon a Rood Screen, they were unobjectionable.

5. That a Credence Table was allowable, as an adjunct to the Communion Table. This, or the ledge in the Chancel wall, often used in old churches, was made necessary, or proper, by the direction in the Rubric as to the time of placing the elements on the Table, to be done by the Priest.

6. That the linen Cloth which covered the Table at the Ministration, must be plain and unadorned with lace, embroidery, or otherwise. Every Judge in every Court, which had the subject before it, concurred in this.

7. That the Carpet of silk or other decent stuff, directed by the canon of 1603, to cover the Table during Divine service (other than on Communion days), might be changed, and be of various colors and ornamentation, subject to the discretion of the Ordinary.

8. That an Organ was lawful as a known adjunct to the singing, directed in the Service Book.

9. The use of Incense in the celebration of the Holy Communion was illegal.

10. The mixing of water with Wine during the Ministration, and as part of it, was unwarranted.

11. The elevation of the Paten and Chalice, during or after the prayer of consecration, was unlawful.

12. The kneeling or prostration during the consecration of the elements, or after the prayer, and before reception by the Minister, was forbidden.

13. The use of lighted Candles upon the Altar during the celebration, not required or employed for the purpose of giving light, was illegal.

Thus we see, that so far as the oft quoted Rubric bears upon a question, the only inquiry is, "Is the article or implement enumerated in the first book of Edward, or plainly deducible, or ancillary to something therein, and known to custom ? "

But the principles declared in the decision are of vastly more value and moment than the decision itself.

One material point is this. Sir Robert Phillimore, in the Court below, considered that every one of the practices complained of before him, including the use of lighted candles, was a ceremony. The paten, for example, upon the table is strictly an ornament in the Rubrical sense; the elevation of that paten, during or after consecration, is a ceremony or ceremonial act.

The Court above express a disposition to agree with the Dean of Arches. It is said: "However candles and candlesticks may *per se* be looked upon as part of the furniture or ornaments of the Church; yet the lighting of the candles, and the consuming of them by burning throughout, and with reference to a service in which they are to act as symbols or illustrations, is itself either a ceremony, or else a ceremonial act forming part of a ceremony, and making the whole ceremony a different one from what it would have been, had the lights been omitted."¹ The Council of Trent is cited, '*De Missæ Ceremoniis et Ritibus, Ceremonia item adhibuit ut mysticas benedictiones, lumina, thymiamata, vestes, aliaque multa.*' There is a clear distinction between the presence in the Church of things inert and unused, and the active use of the same things as part of the administration of a sacrament or a ceremony. If the use of lighted candles in the manner complained of be a ceremony or ceremonial act, it might be sufficient to say, that it is not, nor is any ceremony in which it forms a part, among those retained in the Prayer Book, and it must, therefore, be included among those that are abolished; for the Prayer Book, in the Preface, divides all ceremonies into those two classes: those which are retained are specified; whereas none are abolished specifically or by name; but it is assumed that all are abolished, which are not specifically retained."

Passing by this, however, the use of lighted candles, *if a ceremonial act, or part of a ceremony*, would be prohibited by Queen Elizabeth's Act of Uniformity, and applicable to the present Prayer Book, making it penal to use any other rite, ceremony, order, or form, or manner of celebrating the Lord's Supper, than is set forth in such book, etc., etc.

And the second great principle declared is this: "The rule upon this subject has been already laid down by the Judicial Com-

¹ Admitted, as published. No doubt an error.

mittee in *Liddell vs. Westerton*, and their Lordships are disposed entirely to adhere to it. In the performance of the services, rites, and ceremonies ordered by the Prayer Book, the directions contained in it must be strictly observed. No omission and no addition can be permitted."

Thus is established the absolute integrity and the absolute exclusiveness of the published law, both as to ornaments, strictly, and as to ceremonies consisting of the employment of ornaments, or otherwise. Beyond the limits of the Prayer Book and its Rubrics justly interpreted, nothing is permissible; within it all is safe, because all is lawful. In a previous number of this Review, similar principles were advocated which involved the same results. The deliberate revision of the Book of Common Prayer, like the revision of a statute, presumptively embraced the whole will of the legislating power. If it provided anything upon a particular subject, it must be assumed that nothing else was intended; and omission is as absolute a prohibition, as if the strongest language had been used. When a specific regulation in the book revised is omitted, that is to be deemed rejected and condemned; and when there is no positive enactment upon the point, we are thrown upon other rules of decision, and guides of reasoning, for our government. The subject of vestments will fully illustrate this.

But the great result is this: That the table of the Lord, the Holy Altar of Commemoration, is rescued by the law from the innovations which marred its sublime simplicity. We have enough to teach us deep reverence for the mystical Spiritual Presence of the Saviour before us; to shelter us from the barren dogma of Zuingle, and yet guard us from the deadly peril of transubstantiation. We have prescribed for us, what shall be upon the table during the ministration; and he who adds to, or takes from it in aught, breaks a vow, violates a law, and commits an offense against those entrusted to him, for which forgiveness must be needed.

But the judgment goes further. In its Catholic comprehension, it has rebuked and condemned the disobedient of every class, who substitute their own opinions for the command of the Church. Here lies, we apprehend, a greater danger than in the extravagancies of Ritualism. There is more zeal of proselytism, on one side, and more to aid the work, in the ambitious independence of mind, on the other. But let us hope that all will be brought to feel, that

next to obedience to God's Word, unswerving implicit loyalty to the Prayer Book and devoted zeal in teaching its lessons, is the surest path we can tread on earth for the advancement of our Holy Faith.

Upon the subject of vestments, some special circumstances occur to affect the bearing of the judgment.

Upon the hypothesis that the Rubric in the book of Charles, following the Statute of Elizabeth, is in full force, the first book of Edward (1549) is the absolute guide.

The Rubric at the commencement of the Communion service prescribed that "the Priest that shall execute the Holy Ministry, shall put upon him the vesture appointed for that ministration, that is to say, a white albe plain, with a vestment or cope."

At the end of the Prayer Book were notes for the more faithful explication of the things contained in the book. Among it was provided: "In the saying or singing of matins, and even song, baptizing and burying, the Minister in Parish Churches, or chapels annexed to the same, shall use a surplice; in cathedral Churches and colleges, the Archdeacons, etc., being graduates, may use in the choir, beside their surplices, such hoods as pertaineth to their degree; but in all other places every Minister shall be at liberty to use any surplice, or no. And whensoever the Bishop shall celebrate the Holy Communion in the Church, or execute any other public ministration, he shall have upon him, beside his rochette, a surplice or albe, and a cope or vestment, and also his pastoral staff in his hand, or else borne or holden by his Chaplain."

In the second book of Edward VI. (1552), the Rubrics of the first book were omitted, and in lieu thereof was a direction at the commencement of Morning Prayer, that "the Minister, at the time of the Communion, and at all other times in his ministration, shall use neither albe, vestment, nor cope; but being an Archbishop, or Bishop, he shall have and wear a rochette; and being a Priest or Deacon, shall have and wear a surplice only."

Both the Statutes of Edward, which established these books of Common Prayer, were repealed in the reign of Queen Mary. (1 Mary, Sess. 11, cap. 2, 1553.) This Statute of Mary was repealed by that of 1 Elizabeth, cap. 2, so far as it concerned the second book, that of 1552; but it left the Statute of Mary untouched, so far as it affected the act establishing the first book.

This Statute of Elizabeth fully and expressly reestablished the

second book, with the few alterations which that act introduced. But the twenty-fifth section contained the provision, by which such ornaments of the Church and of the Ministers thereof should be retained and be in use as was in the Church of England, by authority of Parliament in the second year of Edward VI., until other order shall be taken by authority of the Queen's Majesty, with the advice of her Commissioners appointed under the Great Seal of England for Ecclesiastical causes, or of the Metropolitan of the Realm.

A Rubric in Elizabeth's book corresponded with the first clause of this provision of the Statute.

Then the Act of Uniformity (13 and 14 of Charles II.) established the present book, and that contained the Rubric in the form of the original provision in the twenty-fifth section of the Statute of Elizabeth.

We pass over the arguments and facts used to prove that the Rubric had in truth a limited operation, the reasoning from the canons of 1603, from the advertisements of Elizabeth, and the numerous testimonies of a succession of Bishops. Cosin, Sparrow, Montague, and a long line of others, concurred in the view that the direction as to vestments was superseded. But for our purpose, we shall assume that they were wrong, and that the argument of the Ritualists as to the legality of the vestments of the first book of Edward, is, for the English Church, unanswerable.

But in the year 1789, our Church revised the Book of Common Prayer, and omitted the Rubric, and except as to a rochette, made no provision whatever as to vestments. One point upon the principles established is clear. The Church rejected the Rubric, or any thing similar, as her rule.

What then are we to resort to, or are we left guideless? Here is precisely a case in which recourse is to be had to English law. And the inquiry what is that law resolves itself into this: What, if the statutory provision in the Act of Elizabeth had been repealed, and the Rubric in the book of Charles never adopted, would have been that law? The action of our Church has placed her in just that position.

A striking, perhaps conclusive view is, that the provisions of the second book of Edward would have been brought into force and legality. It was particular as to vestments; and, undoubtedly, if the twenty-fifth section of the Act of Elizabeth had not been

enacted, its provisions as to these would have formed the law. The first and second sections of the Statute, established the whole of the second book, with the few specified variations.

So the Act of Uniformity (13 and 14 Car. II.), "reviewed the book of Elizabeth, and ratified the same with the alterations thought fit to be inserted in the same." And thus, but for the Rubric contained in the book, and sanctioned by the statute, the directions of the second book would have formed the law after 1662, as it would have done from the first year of Elizabeth to that time.

Such would have been the law of the English Church on the supposition stated; such the law of the Colonial Church, a law entirely applicable to our position when severed; and a law sustained as far as we know, by all the custom of the Colony which existed.¹

Again, the canons of 1603 may properly be appealed to on the question. They were binding upon the Clergy. Very many were purely local, and inappropriate even to the Colonial Church. But many governed that Church, and are apposite to our own circumstances, and may be resorted to when provisions of a superior authority are not found. The fifty-eighth canon, as to dress, is peculiarly of this character. "Every Minister saying the public prayers, or ministering the sacraments or other rites of the Church, shall wear a decent and comely surplice with sleeves, to be provided at the charge of the Parish. And if any question arise touching the matter of decency or comeliness thereof, the same shall be decided by the discretion of the Ordinary."

"Ministers who were graduates, might wear the hoods pertinent to their degrees. Notwithstanding it shall be lawful for such Ministers as are not graduates to wear upon their surplices, instead of hoods, some decent tippet of black, so it be not silk."

By the twenty-fourth canon, capes were to be worn in cathedral Churches by those who administered the Communion, being assisted by the Gospeller and Epistler, according to the advertisements published anno 7 Elizabeth. By the twenty-fifth canon, in time of Divine service and prayers, in all collegiate and cathedral

¹ The custom is, I think, shown in a rule adopted in Virginia in 1785, and which seems to have continued in force until 1823. "Ministers and Deacons shall wear a surplice during the time of prayer at public worship, in places where they are provided, and wear gowns when they preach where they conveniently can, and shall at all times wear apparel suited to the gravity of their profession." (*Hawks' Contributions, Virginia.*)

Churches, where there is no communion, it shall be sufficient to wear surplices. Graduates to wear hoods according to their degrees.

3. There is a remarkable series of documents of high character, showing conclusively that the provision as to ornaments was not, either in Elizabeth's day or in that of Charles II., construed or acted upon according to its terms.

The Act of Elizabeth was followed in the same year, 1559, by her Injunctions. In 1562 the Bishops set forth their Interpretations of the Injunctions, in which they say, that "There be used only one apparel; as the cape in the ministration of the Lord's Supper, and the surplice in all other ministrations."¹

The Queen's Advertisements in 1564 prescribed the attire to be used in cathedral and collegiate Churches, and these provided, "Every Minister, saying any public prayers, or ministering the sacraments, or other public rites, of the Church, shall wear a comely surplice with sleeves, to be provided at the charge of the Parish."

In Parker's Visitation Articles (1569), one inquiry is, "Whether your Priests, Curates, and Ministers, do use in the celebration of Divine service, to wear a surplice prescribed by the Queen's Injunctions, and the Book of Common Prayer."

By Bishop Sandys' Articles, the clergy were directed, in all Divine services, to use the surplice.

In the Injunctions of Archbishop Grindall (1571), the clergy are enjoined thus: "At all times when ye minister the Holy Sacraments, and upon Sundays and other holy days, when ye say the Common Prayer and other Divine service, in our Parish Churches and Chapels, and likewise at all marriages and burials, to wear a clean and decent surplice with large sleeves."

And by the seventh item, under the title "The Laity," all vestments, albes, tunicles, and stoles, were to be destroyed.²

In 1579 similar visitation articles were issued by the Archbishop.

In 1590, the Archbishop of York inquires whether all capes, vestments, albes, tunicles, and such like relics of Popish superstition, be destroyed.³

¹ Cardwell's *Doc. Ann.* p. 205; Pinnoch's *Laws*, etc., 820.

² *Hierurgia*, 449; Pinnoch, 824.

³ The above are found in Perry's *Lawful Ornaments*, passim.

There is another series of similar documents after the canons of 1603.

Bishop Andrews, in 1625, Bishop Wrenn, in 1636, Bishop Montagu, in 1637, Bishop Juxon, in 1660, and Bridgman, in 1661, inquired in visitation articles, whether the Minister, in saying the public prayers and administering the sacraments, wear a decent surplice with sleeves, and being a graduate, with a hood.¹

So, after the Act of Uniformity, and Prayer Book of Charles II., with the Rubric as to ornaments repeated, Archbishop Freemen, in 1662, Archbishop Shefton, in 1670, Bishop Laney, in 1670, the Archdeacon of Huntington (Bishop Fuller), in 1674, Archdeacon Outram, in 1676, and Bishop Barlow, in 1679, inquire whether the surplice is worn by the Minister in his public ministrations.

This review illustrates the language of the Archbishop of Canterbury, in his reply to the clergy in 1866.

"I cannot but feel that those who have violated a compromise and settlement which has existed for three hundred years, and are introducing vestments and ceremonies of a very doubtful legality, are really, though unconsciously, doing the work of the worst enemies of the Church. That settlement has been acquiesced in, as far as the vestments of the parochial clergy are concerned, by all the seven hundred Prelates who have presided over the Dioceses of England and Wales, from the early part of the reign of Elizabeth to this day. It is a settlement which such wise and holy men as Bishop Andrews, Richard Hooker, and their contemporaries, were content to leave untouched. A settlement which such a high Ritualist as Bishop Cosins not only did not see reason to disturb, but even enforced on the parochial clergy of his Diocese, by the tenor of his Visitation Articles, and that in the face of the Rubric then recently enacted, as it stands in the Prayer Book. From this the natural inference seems to be, that he held the Advertisements of Queen Elizabeth and the canons of 1603, to be nevertheless binding upon him."

The Convocation of Canterbury, June, 1866, adopted a resolution, that the use in Parish Churches of a surplice is a sufficient compliance with the directions of the Church.

But surrendering all this as untenable in England; conceding entirely that the Rubric, authorized by the act of Charles II., definitely settled the vestments of the first book to be legal (a rule being prescribed, which disuse could not annul), we have for our

¹ Pinnoch's *Laws*, 861.

own Church, the exceeding power of the argument derived from this unbroken custom. Nothing could have overcome the conclusiveness of such a custom but a statute or Rubric under it. We have neither the one nor the other. Nay, more, we advisedly, on n review, rejected the Rubric which countervailed the custom.

And thus, by absolute law,¹ ancient, almost unbroken custom for three hundred years, the authority and sanction of a line of Bishops from the days of Elizabeth to the present hour, we have a rule settled with an exactness and absoluteness, unsurpassed by any other governing our Church. We presume to state the results.

The use of a surplice, with the tippet or scarf, in reading morning and evening prayers, baptisms, marriages, burials, and the ministration of the Holy Communion, is prescribed. No other clerical vestment, assumed specially for such offices, is allowable.

It is almost equally clear, that the surplice should be used in preaching on communion days. The argument seems decisive, that the sermon is part of the office.²

That preaching in a surplice at any time is permissible.

But preaching in a gown at other times than when the communion is ministered, is also allowable. The custom is fixed. It is not contrary to the recorded law, and to denounce it seems as unfounded and bigoted as the condemnation of preaching in a surplice.

The scarf, into which the stole, tippet, and scarf of former days seems to be merged, has the warrant of the Church upon similar grounds.

Any change of a vestment (except to a gown when used), any addition to the surplice during a ministration, is illegal. It is to be noted that the first book of Edward, by an inference not to be evaded, forbade any change.

Thus we apprehend great advances have been made toward the settlement, upon enduring principles, of most that is important in Ritualism. What effect ought the judgment to be allowed in our own Church?

In the Preface to the Prayer Book we declare, that "This Church is far from intending to depart from the Church of Eng-

¹ Of course on the right principle of Bishop Hopkins, though erroneously applied, of English applicable law ruling, except as we have changed it.

² So decided by the Bishop of Exeter in Helstay case. See *Hierurgia Anglicana*, 368, and *English Churchman*, No. 93.

land in any essential point of doctrine, discipline, or worship." Now, everything which a Church can announce, or its appointed authorities and tribunals expound, must fall within one of these classes. And it seems most plain, that in the absence of regulation or exposition of our own, what is settled in the Church of England, of pertinence to our own position, is entitled to be treated as presumptively a rule.

But without entering further upon this point, this, at least, could be announced with full assurance. The judgments of the Ecclesiastical tribunals of England (other than upon questions of Faith and Doctrine), interpreting a Rubric, canon, or provision similar in substance to one existing in our own Church, are authorities to be regarded and submitted to, unless proven to be erroneous.

The analogy with our civil rules is strong and applicable. If an English statute has been reenacted in our State, the English decisions upon it are received as law, controlling, if made before the Revolution, and presumptive evidence if afterward. The alliance of our civil institutions with those of England is not more close, nor more of our inheritance, than the alliance of our Church with her Anglican Mother.¹

To this extent, we think, the Bishops of our Church, in dealing with all the excesses and aberrations of the day, might safely go. Almost the whole hierarchy of England has condemned the Ritualistic excesses. With an unprecedented approach to unanimity, our own Bishops have united. Now combine this commanding Episcopal condemnation with this utterance of the truth by the highest tribunal of law, and submission will follow, or disobedience be denounced as faction and rebellion.

Nor will obedience lead to a cold nakedness of ceremonial, or forbid the love of a rich garniture of Church or Chapel from being indulged. Scope enough is left for all that imagination, art, or taste should seek or ought to sanction. But the Church, with this instinct of truth and purity, decides that she will only allow the few emblematic ornaments she has retained, to be upon her altar during the ministration, and that the beauty of holiness is an ample adornment.

¹ See the subject discussed, *Hoffman's Law of the Church*, 64-71.

ART. VI. — THE STATUS OF THE CHURCH.

WHAT is the *status*, position, or Ecclesiastical character of that body of Christians known in the United States as the "Protestant Episcopal Church," — that organization to which we — our readers and ourselves — are presumed to belong, and to which we owe nearest allegiance? Is it an Episcopal *sect*, ranking only among other sects? Is it a "denomination," a "persuasion," a "religious community" of modern formation? Or, is it a true and living branch of the *original Catholic Church*, i. e., of the visible Kingdom of Christ, once for all founded among men? Is it the Church of the ancient Creeds, as those Creeds were anciently understood; or is it an ingenious imitation, bearing in some points a strong resemblance to the original institution, but not legally inheriting its title and Divine birthright?

This question, in all the depth and magnitude of its import, is now unhappily disturbing and unsettling the faith of thousands, and is really at the foundation of most of the controversies and speculations agitating the Church in this restless age.

It is manifest to any intelligent reader of Ecclesiastical History, that an Episcopal Church — or, rather, community — *may* exist as a mere heretical or schismatical body, with no rightful claim to a position within the Catholic Church. An organized body of men, having Bishops, and using a Liturgy, may, or may not, be in that untoward position, — cut off from the stem and root of the Church. Legitimacy depends on other considerations. The presence of an Episcopate, even in the line of Apostolic Succession, does not always prove, imply, or necessitate the presence of the Catholic Church. The Arian, and many other heretical sects of antiquity, had such Bishops, and continued the use of Liturgies, though they were condemned in lawful Councils, and separated from the communion of the Church. Popular as the error may be in these days, the Episcopate does *not* make the Church, though there can be no true Church *without* the Episcopate. Bishops were a Divine appointment to guard and perpetuate the Apostolic Succession of the *Faith*; but the Faith was not so appointed to guard and perpetuate the Apostolic Succession of *Bishops*. Therefore, the Faith is of as much higher consequence than Bishops, as essential truth is more important than the agents who proclaim and transmit it. The Faith is also infallibly protected against loss or fundamental error

by the special overruling action of the Divine Spirit ; though Bishops, individually, are *not* thus infallibly protected, but may, and sometimes do, fall into very serious doctrinal errors. Hence there may be Bishops, with Liturgies also — as we have just said — in a state of separation from the Catholic Church. There may also be bodies, holding a considerable part of the true *Faith*, yet without true Bishops, as in some schismatical communions ; and even the reception of the *whole* Creed verbally but under some special interpretation not recognized by the Catholic Church, will not relieve such bodies from the charge of schism, and bring them within the unity of the Church.

Such considerations as these will show with sufficient clearness for our present purpose, not only the state of the question as regards the Protestant Episcopal Church, but also the extent of its ramifications, and the unquestionable gravity of its issues and relations. For, to deny that this Church has an Apostolic Succession of the *Faith*, is, virtually, to denounce her as an heretical sect ; and to deny that she possesses an Apostolical Succession of *Bishops*, is, virtually, to reduce her to the position of a schismatical body. But, to believe, hold, and teach, that she has inherited, by true historical sequence, both the Faith and the Order of the Apostles, is to vindicate her own righteous and indefeasible claim to be a true branch of the “ one, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church.”

But, admitting all this, we arrive at a question often asked, even by some, we are sorry to say, within her communion, — “ Does the Protestant Episcopal Church herself *really make and defend such a claim* ? or, is it not rather an assumption of some of her more ardent sons ? an exaggeration of the principles laid down by her Reformers ? and, at the best, a matter which lies chiefly, if not altogether, within the range of speculation and private opinion ? ” To this we answer — and hope to prove — that the clergy *does* most distinctly and resolutely assert such a claim. Her very existence *as a Church* rests on the position thus assumed, namely, that she is in historical continuity with the Catholic Church of all ages, both in Faith and Order. He therefore, we repeat, who places the *status* of the Protestant Episcopal Church on any lower foundation, inevitably degrades her, in his own mind at least, to the level of a mere religious sect ; and, by consequence, ought to consider himself as no other than a sectarian, if enrolled among her members. There cannot be any other issue consistently with a logical

adjustment of simple historical facts, and an admission of their legitimate consequences. 'This, as we shall see, was substantially the ground taken by those who organized the American Church. If we are not *in* the Catholic Church, we are certainly *out* of it. If we are not *in* the vine once planted, we are either branches which have been separated from it, or exist as a mere parasitical and external growth, cumbering, but drawing no life from the vigor of the stem. There is no middle position, except, perhaps, for those under the ban of excommunication, hereafter to be reunited to the Church, on their repentance and renunciation of error. Hence the earnestness with which our forefathers sought, in the early days of American independence, the confirmation of their unity with the Anglican Church, by virtue of an Episcopate — the correlative of the Faith which they already possessed.

Evidence that the Church has all along recognized and maintained her true place in the Catholic body, — whatever may have been the erratic opinions and utterances of individuals in her communion, — is to be gathered from her appeal to the Primitive Church as her source; from her public acts in Council or otherwise; from her formal and authoritative documents; and from that consciousness of freedom from heresy or schism, and of identity with the body of Christ, which underlies and rules all her determinations on questions pertaining to her entity as a Church. If the Protestant Episcopal Church, at any supposable period, actually abandoned this ground, and assumed a sectarian *status*, or even a sectarian *theory*, that change could only have occurred under a formidable revolution, distinctly marked at the time, and sure to be indelibly written on the record of her history. Such a revolution could not — in the nature of things — have been *quietly* accomplished, and accepted in all quarters without remonstrance; for, so radical a departure from primitive Truth and Order would have placed the American Church in instant antagonism with the parent Church of England, and with the express terms of her own standards. No orthodox Bishops in the wide world would then have extended to her the Episcopate. No other Church would have congratulated her on the completion of her independent national organization. No fraternal intercourse would have been held with her. No Lambeth Conference would have received her pseudo-Bishops; and at no altar of the Anglican Church could her Ministers presume to stand, or be suffered to officiate.

Such an event, therefore, must be ruled out of the case, as a delusion too gross and palpable to be entertained, except by incurable credulity and ignorance. If the Church ever sacrificed her birthright, and threw herself into alliance and sympathy with the sects around her, at only one time could this possibly have occurred, namely, in the "troublous times" of the Revolutionary War, or amid the unsettled state of Ecclesiastical affairs immediately following. But, strong as were the temptations, at that period, to modify and popularize the venerable principles and ancient usages of the Church, yet, no vital and essential change really took place either in her Creed, Ministry, or Sacraments. After the war, the Church in the Colonies, which had been under the Bishop of London, simply became the Church in the United States, under the rule of her own Bishops,—changing nothing fundamental, but confining herself chiefly to such modifications of external discipline and worship, as were required by the new posture of her civil relations, and by the peculiarities of her undeveloped and youthful condition.

There is much obscurity, however, in the public mind, respecting the condition, the tone of feeling, and the tendency of action distinguishing the Church at this eventful—and, in some respects, perilous—portion of her history. Our attention is now very naturally and primarily given to the Church in her present enlarged range, and her manifold forms of enterprise; while the contemplation of those past days of hard struggling with adversity and prejudice, which tried the souls of our forefathers, seems not attractive enough to win much of our time and sympathy. Still, it is hardly possible to obtain a full grasp of the truth that the Protestant Episcopal Church never quitted for a moment her Catholic foundation, without noticing with a careful eye the peculiarities, the strange trials, and the various evolutions of thought and action which mark her early history. Sometimes we are startled by movements which seem to indicate a state of nervous trepidation and hopelessness; or our fears are stirred by disquieting words which suggest the outbreking of some local disaffection; or, we hear of the venturing of propositions utterly subversive of all ancient Order; and then, on the reverse, our hope and joy spring up, as we realize the presence of valiant hearts and unflinching voices, overruling all the elements of apprehended strife, and wisely proceeding to ather into harmony, consistency, and beauty, the

materials of a Church, the grandeur of whose destiny could only then be seen in the bright promise coincident with its dawning.

It will be necessary therefore for us, and also a convenience to the reader, to examine, with some particularity, the state of facts and opinions at this era of the Church, when, as we contend, Catholic truth became eventually triumphant over all the obstacles which encumbered her way.

More than fourscore years have now passed since the American Church received her complete organic form, as a distinct visible body, possessing the Apostolic Succession of Order and Doctrine, together with the necessary apparatus of Catholic worship. Previously, several of the elements entering into the idea of a perfect Ecclesiastical organization were wanting. Under the Colonial administration the Church was simply a foreign Mission, consisting of Presbyters and bands of laymen, here and there gathered into parishes or congregations; — these also scattered over a vast region, with little or none of the unity arising from combination, and cut off from the personal supervision and the spiritual privileges flowing from the Episcopate. "In the Northern and Eastern States," says Bishop White, "the comparatively small number of the Church of England may be seen in the fact, that when the revolutionary war began, there were not more than about eighty parochial clergymen of that Church to the northward and eastward of Maryland.¹ . . . In Maryland and in Virginia the Episcopal Church was much more numerous, and had legal establishments for its support. . . . In the more southern Colonies, the Episcopalians were fewer in proportion than in the two last mentioned, but more than in the northern." (Memoirs, pp. 17, 18.)

In this abnormal and rudimentary condition, the powers of a living, aggressive, and thoroughly disciplined section of the great army of Christ, could not but be far less thought of by the Church, than the fact of inability to cope manfully with outside forces or inward obstacles, by reason of the weakness necessarily springing from constitutional and structural imperfection. Not a single Bishop was there on the soil, till after the war, to feed and govern the flock. Large numbers of the laity had consequently never received the grace of Confirmation. For the reception of Holy Orders a voyage to England, — perilous enough in those days, — was an indispensable preliminary. All the churches in the land

¹ Note 1.

were unconsecrated. No Diocesan canons and regulations had existence for the efficient ordering of this outlying division of the Christian host.¹ Questions of discipline, and local variances and discords, could reach their final solution only by reference to a distant authority, subject to inevitable delay, and to probable misconception of the points at issue. "The Bishop of London, indeed," says Bishop Wilberforce, "had his commissaries in America, but their limited power and derived authority could do little when their principal was on the other side of the Atlantic." (p. 106.) All things, in short, were in a mere transitional and expectant condition, when the instinct of self-preservation takes an almost exclusive control of the powers of life, while the decision and energy of a fully developed organism are necessarily referred to the future. Efforts had indeed been made, especially in the northern colonies, for the Episcopate; but met with "much opposition," from the fear "that Bishops, sent from England to America, would of course bring with them, or, if not, might be clothed by the paramount authority of Britain, with the powers of English Bishops, to the great prejudice of people of other communions, and in contrariety to the principles on which the settlement of the Colonies had taken place." (Memoirs, p. 19.) Bishop White also remarks that he had "lived in days in which there existed prejudices in our land against the name, and much more against the office, of a Bishop; and when it was doubtful whether any person in that character would be tolerated in the community." (Memoirs, Dedication, p. 1.)

The influence of the American Revolution on the Church it is not easy to estimate, though we may recognize and trace it in many of the Ecclesiastical movements of those times, with which contemporary history brings us into acquaintance, and of which we have authentic records. It was quite natural that during the revolutionary war, public sentiment should be more or less hostile to a Church, which, in its external relations, at least, was generally considered as an adjunct of England's Constitution, and therefore imbued with ideas, sympathies, and tendencies, not in harmony with American principles or predilections. During the struggle for independence, when the whole land trembled under that fierce storm of indignation which the aggressions of the parent State had provoked, there was neither time nor opportunity to impress on the

¹ Note 2.

public mind a distinct sense of the difference between the Church of Christ *in itself*, and the "*establishment*" formed by its accidental and not necessary alliance with an earthly empire. To the common apprehension of the people, England and England's Church were so indissolubly and vitally united, that faithfulness to the latter was regarded as an indication of loyalty to the former. The Cross seemed so closely associated with the Crown, that it could not readily be contemplated apart, or viewed as an independent object; and so, it received little favor, — except among the more discriminating, — amid the rush and swell of the general obloquy. And thus the Church became an object of patriotic jealousy and dislike; as if, under her Divine constitution, there lay concealed some secret inquisitorial element, which could never be effectually brought into accord with the maintenance of human rights, and the peaceful exercise of conscience and religious liberty.¹ It was a mistake, doubtless, of the worst kind, but readily pardonable, considering the tone and direction which public thought had taken during years of strife and dark suspense. And the error lingered on for some years after the war, even influencing the minds of a few Churchmen, from whom we should have expected wiser things. Evidence of this, however, may be readily found in the well-known indifference, here and there exhibited, to the introduction of Bishops; in one instance, at least, showing itself in the proposal of measures which touched the very foundations of the Church; and, if carried out, would have converted an important portion of it into a non-Episcopal sect.

This misapprehension of the office of Bishops, strengthened also as it certainly was by Puritanical and other sectarian influences, was not, however, the only impediment which stood in the way of an organization of the Church on Catholic principles, after the restoration of peace. Many of the clergy, not willing to change their political relations, and become citizens of a new commonwealth, had resigned their appointments, and returned to the mother country. During the war, says Bishop White, "many able and worthy Ministers, cherishing their allegiance to the King of Great Britain, and entertaining conscientious scruples against the use of the Liturgy, under the restriction of omitting the appointed prayers for him, ceased to officiate." Owing to this, "the doors of the far greater number of the Episcopal churches were closed for several years"² (p. 20.)

¹ Note 3.² Note 4.

The parishes, thus weakened and checked in their growth by unavoidable circumstances during a protracted revolutionary struggle, were also—in many cases—remote from each other, and lay scattered among the various States on the sea-board, entirely severed from Episcopal supervision, and reduced in appearance, though not in fact or theory, to a position very much resembling that of mere Congregational societies. Considerable indecision, and anxiety concerning the future, was naturally felt, and its impress is to some degree visible in the acts and counsels of even earnest minded and thoughtful men. The connection existing through the Bishop of London, remarks Bishop White, “had been confessedly destroyed by the Revolution; and therefore, it was evident, that without creating some new ties, the Churches in the different States, and even those in the same State, might adopt such varying measures as would forever prevent their being combined in one communion.” (p. 21.) We cannot, therefore, easily overrate the difficulties of those times, or too gratefully admire the interposition of wisdom more than human, in guiding and overruling for good the deliberations of those, who, in a time of extreme peril, may safely be said to have held in their hands, not only the *destinies*, but also the very *existence* of the American Church.

It will therefore be easily apprehended that the chief and immediate object of our early Conferences and Conventions was, to draw together and mould into a consistent and Churchly form under a true Episcopate, the disunited groups of material which, in city, village, and rural settlement, had been gathered by the labor of Pastors and Missionaries, and now needed only the attraction of a centralizing force to bring them into a state of closer unity, organic relation, and brotherly concord.

The first effort in this direction appears to have been made in the year 1784, at the suggestion of the Rev. Abraham Beach, of New Jersey. Several clergymen of New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania, having occasion to meet at New Brunswick, on the 13th and 14th of May, in that year, conferred together on the subject of union. A larger meeting was held in New York on the 5th of October following, at which there were present delegates from eight of the thirteen States. Meetings for exchange of opinion, and the formation and furtherance of plans for a comprehensive union, were also held in several of the States,—outlines of a General Constitution were drafted, and finally, at the General Convention

of 1789, these outlines were brought into regular form, and adopted as a bond of union by the Church.

It is to our purpose now to inquire, — What was the determinate judgment of these Conventions, — the ultimate decision at which they arrived, — respecting *the real position and character of the Church*? Did they place it, substantially, on sectarian ground, as merely one among many “Churches” or denominations? Or did they ratify and confirm her already existing rights as a portion of the “one Catholic and Apostolic Church?”

It must be conceded that, at a first glance, the proceedings of our early Conventions are rather disappointing than otherwise, to one who looks for the strong, outspoken, and thoroughly Church-like words and deeds of really Catholic-minded men. Instead of this, we meet with utterances of opinion, and the bringing forward of measures, radically incompatible with the perpetuation of ancient principle and order, and implying at least considerable uncertainty and distrust on the part of those who introduced and supported them. Of course, in open Conventions, gathered at times of great disadvantage, and consisting only in part of well-read theologians and experts in Ecclesiastical and Liturgical history, such things will be, and more especially in cases where some of the parties imagine that no Church principle binds them (after a civil revolution), till they have themselves adopted it by vote and formal consent. At the very inception of efforts for the reintegration of the Church, proofs came to light of the existence of such a spirit as this — distrustful of all authoritative teaching, and disposed rather to construct a Church modified to suit the times, than to uphold and sustain with jealous vigilance the old and venerable heritage of the saints. Amid the confusion and disorder which ushered in a new era of civil and political liberty, there were men who lost sight of the eternal and unchangeable nature of the truths proclaimed as Divine within the visible kingdom of Christ. Liberty in the affairs of time and the world, was by them so construed as to seem a legitimate argument for entire freedom in receiving, or variously interpreting the things of God, and the fundamental principles of His Church. Already there had sprung up a Rationalistic and irreverent system of thought, which measured the value of all things heretofore held sacred, by the standard of every one’s own judgment or bias; and thus the course and tendency of religious movement was liable to be sensibly affected by the degree of

tolerance which public sentiment would grant to the enunciation of ancient dogma, and the principles of Ecclesiastical polity and worship. It is not surprising, then, to find that this spirit had penetrated, more or less, even into the minds of otherwise well meaning Churchmen. It was, indeed, an evil which came like poison floating in the air, enervating the spiritual life and vigor which the crisis needed, and seriously weakening that robustness of faith and unflinching determination of purpose, which, in ages past, so often carried the Church triumphantly through periods of trial and dangerous allurements.

But though there were exhibited in the Conventions, and otherwise, these signs of weakness, presumption, and even of incipient schism, yet such errors were almost always traceable to *individuals* who had not fairly counted the cost; while the great body of solid thought in those assembled presented an entirely different complexion, and contemplated a far more resolute and truthful purpose. Taking for its basis the *preëxisting* Church, it carefully refrained from all fundamental changes, and formed decisions, which, though expressed in agreement with modern terminology, yet boldly recognized and clearly affirmed the *primitive* and *only defensible idea of the Christian Church*. The evidences of this are manifold, though they may not always strike the eye of the general reader, or seem to rise above the level of very ordinary and familiar statement. Thus, in the Preface to the Prayer Book, it is stated, with all desirable precision of language, that "This Church is *far from intending to depart from the Church of England in any essential point of doctrine, discipline, or worship*; or further than local circumstances require." Assuming, then, as we have a right to do, that the Church of England is not a sect, — not a religious "denomination" created within the last three hundred years, — but a true branch of the Catholic Church, it follows, by just and necessary deduction from the above words, that the *American Church* is so likewise, — being in her spiritual aspect, not a new "denomination sprung out of the American Revolution, but a *continuation* of the Anglican Church, modified only in such matters of discipline as were required by the change of political and social relations.

And that this identity in organic life with the Anglican Catholic Church is not a fiction, devised to support an unfounded theory, will appear from the writings and acts of Bishop White and his

contemporaries. Thus the Bishop tells us that "the object kept in view, in all the consultations held, and the determinations formed, was the *perpetuating* of the Episcopal Church, on the ground of the general principles *which she had inherited from the Church of England*; and of not departing from them, except so far as either local circumstances required, or some very important cause rendered proper." (p. 33.) Again, alluding to "the *pretence* made by some, that the Episcopal Church in the United States *began* with its *obtaining the Episcopacy*," he adds, "A mere name does not characterize the Church as *new*, but may arise from civil changes, in various ways to be conceived of. What was formerly 'the Church of England in America,' did not *cease to exist* on the removal of the Episcopacy of the Bishop of London, by the Providence of God, but assumed a new name, as the dictate of propriety." (p. 99.) "The *identity* of the body remained, although accompanied by a newly-acquired independence." (p. 221.) The same writer regarded this as a subject "big with important consequences," and proceeds to state at some length his own "reasons for supporting the position, that what is now called 'the Episcopal Church in the United States of America' is *precisely, in succession, the body formerly known by the name of 'the Church of England in America.'*" (p. 222.) But the most decisive proof yet remains. In the General Convention of 1814, a Declaration was issued, affirming that "the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, is *the same body* heretofore known in these States by the name of 'the Church of England;' the change of name, although not of religious principle, in doctrine, or in worship, or in discipline, being induced by a characteristic of the Church of England, supposing the independence of Christian Churches, under the different sovereignties to which respectively their allegiance in civil concerns belongs. But that when the severance alluded to took place, and ever since, this Church conceives of herself as professing and acting on the principles of the Church of England is evident from the organization of her Conventions, and from their subsequent proceedings as recorded on the journals." ¹ (p. 357.) This was agreed to by both Houses, and its title is "Concerning the *identity of this Church with the former Church of England in America.*" We only add the words of Bishop Seabury,

¹ This Declaration "arose from the circumstance that in some cause or causes pending in the courts, this identity had been denied." — *Memoirs*, p. 221.

in a letter to Dr. Smith, of Maryland, "Your Church is *still* the Church of England, subsisting under a different civil government." (Memoirs, p. 287.)

If it be said that this "identity" or sameness had reference solely to the Church of England in her *modern* or *reformed* aspect, and did not involve the idea of any anterior existence, as necessary to the transmission of a valid Episcopate, we reply that, though such an opinion might have been held or favored by persons of insufficient learning, or by others in hours of bewilderment and almost despair concerning the Church; yet, the whole weight of authoritative evidence is on the other side. For the demand made for Bishops was grounded on the fact of *Divine, Apostolical, and primitive institution*; on a Succession carried down from the first planting of the Church in Britain, and *inherited* by the Anglican Bishops and Archbishops to whom application was made by the American Church. A Succession dating from the time of Queen Elizabeth, or even from Edward VI., and having no previous existence, was not such a Succession as would have been accepted. A Church only 250 years old would have been as useless, in the judgment of Bishops Seabury, White, and Provost, to convey the Apostolic authority, as, in our eyes, a cable 250 miles long would be to transmit a message across the ocean. The words of our forefathers are too plain to admit of doubt on this point. For instance, in the address of the Convention of 1785 to the English Archbishops, there is expressed an "earnest desire and resolution to retain the venerable form of Episcopal government, *handed down to them, as they conceived, from the time of the Apostles*; and endeared to them by the remembrance of the holy *Bishops of the Primitive Church*, of the blessed martyrs who reformed the doctrine and worship of the Church of England," etc. (p. 293). Again, Bishop Seabury, in a letter to Dr. Smith, says, "The rights of the Christian Church arise, not from nature or compact, but from the institution of Christ; and we ought not to alter them, but to receive and maintain them as the holy Apostles left them. The government, sacraments, faith, and doctrine of the Church are *fixed and settled*. We have a right to examine *what they are*, but we must take them *as they are*. If we new model the government, why not the sacraments, creeds, and doctrines of the Church? But then it would not be *Christ's Church*, but *our Church*, and would remain so, call it by what name we please." (p. 291.)

If it be alleged that Bishop White, on a certain occasion, showed himself to be otherwise minded, we accept the fact of his temporary aberration from the right way; to which we will also append some account of the forcible rebuke which he earned by so doing, and of the amends he afterwards made for the error, by receiving in his own person, the grace of the Apostolate. In the year 1783, Bishop (then Mr.) White issued a small pamphlet suggesting, as a temporary and extraordinary expedient, the appointment of Presbyters to perform Episcopal acts, until a true succession could be obtained. Whereupon the assembled clergy of Connecticut, through the Rev. Abraham Jarvis, expressed their indignation at so plain a violation of Church order as that proposed; and in their letter of remonstrance to the author of the pamphlet, we find such terms as the following: "You quote concessions from the venerable Hooker and Dr. Chandler, which their exuberant charity to the reformed Churches abroad, led them to make. But the very words you quote from the last mentioned gentleman prove his opinion to be, that Bishops were as truly an ordinance of Christ, and as essential to His Church as the Sacraments; for, say you, he insists upon it (meaning the Episcopal superiority) as of Divine right, asserts that the laws relating to it bind as strongly as the laws which relate to Baptism and the Holy Eucharist, and *that if the succession be once broken, not all the men on earth, not all the angels in heaven, without an immediate commission from Christ, can restore it*; but you say, he does not, however, hold this succession to be necessary, only where it can be had. Neither does he or the Christian Church hold the Sacraments to be necessary, where they cannot be had agreeable to the appointment of the Great Head of the Church. Why should particular acts of authority be thought more necessary than the authority itself? Why should the Sacraments be more essential than that authority Christ has ordained to administer them? It is true that Christ has appointed the Sacraments, and it is as true that he hath appointed officers to administer them, and has expressly forbid any to do it but those who are authorized by His appointment, or called of God as was Aaron" (Note 5, p. 284).

To the passages already quoted as distinct assertions of Apostolic Succession, might readily be added numerous incidental expressions in Conventional and other documents, showing how generally it was understood that the American Church was not only

like the "primitive," but was identical with it, as a river with its fountain-head ; that the Church was "Apostolical," not only in doctrine, but in direct lineal derivation ; that she sought and obtained the "Apostolic Succession" not merely as a gift from England's Church, but, through that, from the glorious company of the Apostles, and their Divine Head, "the King of Glory ;" that she set forth an Ordinal which, as with a rod of iron, dashes in pieces all uncatholic theories ; that she retained the great Creed of Nice, in spite of all assaults ; that she reasserted the ancient doctrine of Sacramental grace ; and thus preserved and displayed the reality of that unity with the foregoing Church, which, at length, has culminated in the visible embrace of both branches of the Anglican Episcopate in fraternal Council.

From this brief and necessarily imperfect review of facts relating to the position occupied by the Protestant Episcopal Church, only one conclusion seems possible, namely, that her Catholic *status* was recognized and understood, both by the Prelates of England, and by her own Conventions and most learned divines. It is true, that the position thus affirmed *might* have been expressed in terms more precise, scientific, rigidly exact, and conformable to Ecclesiastical usage, than those which were held to be sufficient at the time. And this apparent indefiniteness of statement in documents where the contrary might have been presumed and expected, this adoption of prevailing modes of speech, even at the risk of ambiguity and misconstruction, has of late years been extensively and boldly used as a source of argument *against* the view here taken of the Catholicity of the Church both in Faith and Order. Doubtless much vague and really groundless reasoning would have been avoided, had stronger and more positive language been employed in the documents to which appeal is made. But on the other hand, great allowance must be made for those who drew them up, or modified such as already existed. If the reader will only recall to mind what we have just stated relative to the disturbed condition of religious thought at the era of the Revolution, he will find a probable reason for the very guarded language in which, sometimes, the claims of the Church are expressed or assumed. The presence, at that period, of so much that was in a high degree adverse to Catholic truth in all its fullness and detail, could not fail to have the effect of suggesting great prudence and caution in the early Councils of the Church. For the problem

remained to be solved, whether the Church in her then depressed condition, destitute, for the most part, of endowments, and therefore dependent, could openly and fearlessly challenge for herself the title, the rights, and the authority which certainly belonged to her, without creating so vast an amount of misapprehension in the then uninformed state of the public mind, as would be likely to alienate many of her adherents, and probably stir up and perpetuate a general and most destructive spirit of hostility. This was a point — and an exceedingly embarrassing and painful one — which must have forced itself into prominence, so soon as the task of “setting in order the things that were wanting” came fairly and in formal shape before the Church. Theoretically speaking, the case was a plain one. The derivation of the Church from the Apostles’ times; her continuity as a portion of the Catholic body; and her legitimate title to all the rights and privileges appertaining to such a body, were not to be disputed. But whether the time had come for the assertion of such claims at all risks, and without any regard to contingencies; or whether a policy partaking somewhat of the nature of reserve, should be pursued, until reason, good sense, calm reflection, and better information, had removed the scales from men’s eyes, and enabled them to see clearly the objective reality of truths too long misapprehended and even denied, — this was a question demanding for its decision all the prudence, wisdom, calmness, and foresight of possible issues which the Church could then summon and put into exercise.

It is hardly possible to contemplate what was said and done in the Councils of that day, including the consultations and deliberations anterior to the obtaining of the Episcopate, without perceiving that some powerful disturbing cause was operating *ab extra*, for the induction of certain irregularities and deflexions from the long-established course of the Church, which, if rendered permanent, would by necessity, sooner or later, affect her equilibrium as a component part of the Ecclesiastical system, and expose her to all the hazards of an impetuous centrifugal agency. We know not, exactly, how far the tendency on the side of concession was allowed to operate, as a yielding to the spirit of the times, in hope of a prospective return to the more normal position; but we see it in the abortive attempt to set aside the Nicene Creed; in the rejection of the Creed of S. Athanasius; in objections to one of the Articles of the Apostles’ Creed; in the excision or the tempering of

expressions in the Baptismal and Communion Offices, the forms of Absolution, the Catechism, the Rubrics, and throughout the Liturgy, as exhibited in the "Proposed Book." And yet, though many of these alterations, eliminations, and verbal changes, were carried by final legislation, every adverse proposition affecting the *foundation and essence* of the Church, was rejected with an amount of decision which showed conclusively that, whatever might be the fears of the timid, the Church really meant to maintain her true ground, and to suffer no violence to be done to any essential principle touching her Divine organization, or the integrity of her Divine Faith. No argument, therefore, founded upon the dissimilarity presumed to exist between the reserved and qualified language of our early Conventions, etc., and that of the ancient Catholic Councils and Fathers can deserve consideration, so long as it may be proved that the *same truths* were enunciated by both parties, and that the differences of expression are resolvable into the natural issues of different circumstances.

Of similar inconsequence is the argument based on the words, "this Church," in the Preface to the Ordinal and elsewhere. It is alleged that though the Church insists on a Ministry of three Orders *within her own bounds*, and deems such a Ministry Apostolical, yet she passes no judgment on *other* ministries, but simply indicates her own preference, and lays down the rule that "No man shall be accounted or taken to be a lawful Bishop, Priest, or Deacon, in *this Church*," unless he has had "Episcopal Consecration or Ordination." Now this very same Preface gives us *the reason why* the Church adopts such a rule; for it opens with a declaration that this threefold Ministry has always been that of "*Christ's Church*;" and, by inevitable consequence, no other can be recognized as possessing the Divine sanction and authority. It is simply an application of the principle, "*Expositio unius, exclusio est alterius*." The Head of the Church established one well-defined Ministry, which Ministry (and no other, as all history testifies), has been identified with the Church in all ages and lands; has perpetuated itself in one uniform mode; and has retained within itself the sole prerogative and right of governing the flock of Christ, and of executing every function of the sacred office. Hence, when any new branch of the Church is formed, it is judged proper that it should bear witness to its own integrity, by proclaiming to all other branches its reception of the Catholic Creed, and

the Catholic Ministry. It declares, in solemn Council and public document, not only its adhesion to the Christian Faith, but also that "in *this Church*"—as in all other local or national portions of the Catholic body—the Apostolic Ministry alone is recognized, received, and venerated. Now what this has to do with an acknowledgment of the ministries of sects around as equally valid, we do not clearly see. The Church would have defined her local standing by the words "*this Church*," even if there had not been a sect, or a sectarian Minister, on the whole American continent. How *otherwise* could she speak, when bearing testimony concerning *herself*? When the canons of a General Council are sent to the various national Churches for confirmation or otherwise, the affirmative answer for each becomes necessarily, "*This Church* receives the same." Who would be credulous enough to believe that such a formula was purposely used to cover a recognition of the sects or heresies around as "sister Churches," bodies, indeed, that have no respect for such canons? To test the matter in question, let a Presbyterian or other Minister, of the most distinguished standing, and venerable both for age and learning, present himself as desirous of a field of labor within "*this Church*," and he will soon discover that "*this Church*" receives him as a mere layman; places him among her candidates for Orders; gives him several months of probation, and finally admits him, with an utter abnegation of his former alleged position as a chief pastor, to the *lowest order* of the Christian Ministry, telling him how he ought now to perform the humble duties of a "Deacon in the Church of God," and not to preach unless specially thereto "licensed by the Bishop himself." We apprehend that, after going through the trying process,—"enough," said one, "to break all one's bones,"—he would not find occasion to thank the Ordinal for any generous acknowledgment of his former Ministry; seeing that, in all its course, and in the questions put to him by the Bishop, he is treated as one merely *seeking* a sacred office, but in no sense qualified to exercise it, till consecrated hands have been laid on him, and the final word given, "*Take thou authority*."

Nor will this far-fetched and very fragile style of argument derive much support from those words in the Preface to the Prayer Book, which assert that under our political constitution, "the different religious denominations of Christians in these States were left at full and equal liberty to model and organize their respective

Churches, and forms of worship," etc. For, from a Congressional point of view, all Christian bodies, including the Roman and Anglican branches of the Church, are placed in the same category with the most inconsiderable and evanescent developments of sectarianism, which, at any time, might gain existence and a name. In adverting to this fact, the Church justifies her right to legislate for herself, without civil interference, on the ground that religious liberty was conceded to all parties alike; and, in making this statement, she uses the popular and current language of the day, never suspecting that mischievous inferences would ever be drawn from it, as if she meant thereby, to locate herself among the "denominations," and thus descend from her lofty Catholic position. Had she intended *this*, or designed to make so vast and fundamental a concession, it would have been otherwise done than by a passing remark in the Preface to her Prayer Book. Nor does the Church recognize and acknowledge the true Ecclesiastical character of the "denominations," when she thus courteously speaks of them as sharing the common liberty to organize "their respective *Churches*." Let the trial of such an hypothesis be made by the election of a sectarian Minister to a Rectorship, or even to a post of missionary duty in any of our Dioceses, and it will soon be seen that the authority of his "Church" to confer Ordination will be utterly ignored, and denied. And this too, *not* simply on the ground of his belonging to *another* Church, but for the far deeper reason that — unlike a Romish or Greek priest — he is not as yet invested with clerical authority in *the Church of God*. Hence the Bishop, on ordering him as a Deacon, would not use a formula recognizing, even in the remotest way, his former standing, and contemplating a mere *transference* into another branch of the Church; would not receive him by saying, "Take thou authority to minister henceforth in the *Protestant Episcopal Church*;" but would approach him as one whose previous commission was so entirely null and void as to justify and demand the use of those unambiguous words: "Take thou authority to execute the office of a Deacon in *the Church of God committed unto thee*." Of course, no such thing would be done, or *could* be done, without sacrilege, if the Church had designed, in the words of the Preface, to acknowledge the "respective Churches" and "denominations" as equally with herself the inheritors of Catholic rank, power, and character. The Church concedes nothing by

using popular language on occasions when precision is not necessary, or when the usages of society justify a courteous relaxation of the severity and strictness of technical formulae. The Bible itself abounds with cases parallel to that we are considering. And if the Catholicity of the "denominations" around is to be assumed, because, in an informal way, the Preface to the Prayer Book styles them "Churches," then, for the same reason, may we assume that the Scriptures plainly acknowledge a *plurality of Gods*, because they often refer to "the gods of the nations," as if such "gods" held "divided empire" with the only Lord of heaven and earth. In other words, if, in the former case, many *Churches* are proved, then, in the latter, we are obliged, by the force of terms, to confess many *Gods*. We much prefer, however, to believe that the Bible everywhere bears testimony only to one true and living *God*, and that the Prayer Book everywhere acknowledges only one, Holy, Catholic *Church*. As there is no *Polytheism* in the one, so is there no *Polykirkism* in the other.

We thank God, then, that the Church in these States *is* what she claims to be, whenever, in the Creed, she speaks forth her grand and ancient name. All other names must yield to this as local, unessential, and imperfect, — perhaps also transient, and superfluous. The *Creed name* is founded on authority; the territorial or accidental name springs only from external relations and circumstances. If the American Church chose to style herself "Protestant Episcopal," she must have existed *before* she assumed the name. She existed as a portion of the Catholic Church; and may, therefore, at any hour rescind the name as indescriptive, misleading, and injurious to her standing as the Church of the living God. There are reasons — and powerful ones, too — why the Church should, in this age, fearlessly declare what she really *is*, and stand forth, before all eyes, in her only true aspect. Let the Church allow herself to be received, *without protest*, as only one among a hundred sects, — even as a sect provided with Bishops, — or as one of the Churches of the day, recommending itself to special notice by its mildness of doctrine, its orderly ways, its gentle discipline, its liberality, respectability, refinement, and freedom from the political and fanatical excesses which have rendered large portions of sectarianism unpopular and even offensive, — let *this* be her prospectus, and the charter of her claims, while the real and fundamental truth concerning her Divine original, her

nature, character, and authority over human souls is kept back from public view, or coldly taught in generalities, or glozed over and treated as a theological abstraction, or uttered with trembling lips and in terms betraying faint heartedness and indecision, — and what *must* be the result? It may be the gathering of considerable numbers of men into parishes, displaying, indeed, a superficial vitality and pecuniary strength; but *not* grounded and settled in a faith which shall qualify them to stand firm and unshaken, when Rome enters the field with her staunch legions, — legions that know no temporizing, and feel no distrust or hesitation as they unfurl *their* banner in the name of the Holy Catholic Church.¹ Too much of this timid policy have we shown already, — too much reluctance to present the Church in all the fullness of her ivine prerogative, as the body of Christ, through which we enter into union with Him, are made one with Him, and partake of the gifts and powers of the world to come, by the Spirit who governs and pervades all things in the kingdom of God on earth and in heaven. In consequence, public sentiment is at fault in its search for the Church of God. It asks for the Catholic Church, and we show it a book or a treatise, instead of a glorious army with banners. It asks for a tangible fact, and we give it a learned theory. It needs, demands, and *will have* a positive resting-place for souls, amid the frightful jars and discords of the age; and while Rome responds boldly to the cry, we only answer that under the veil of Protestant Episcopacy may be found by intellectual men, the ark for the saving of the world.

And thus, the masses of men, — even tens of thousands who call themselves “Episcopalians,” — have no clear conception of “this Church” as Catholic, other than in the retention of several ancient words and phrases, in the continuance of a number of ancient usages, and in the occasional defense of an ancient title. It is the natural issue of imperfect teaching, and of the virtual surrender of the ruling and pastoral power of the Clergy. We have thrown open our Church doors, and invited the world to come in; and the world enters, without giving promise of submission to the Church’s teaching, or of love and devotion to her principles. In eager haste for advance, we have sought for numbers. And to *gain* those numbers, expediency advises that the popular idea of the “Episcopal Church” shall not be much disturbed. And to *keep* those numbers, necessity soon demands that the clergy shall

¹ Note 6.

not amaze the flock by unfolding to its gaze the glorious form and attributes of the one Catholic Church.

Thus sectarian influences have gained a wide diffusion within the Church, encircling the earnest pastor with fears of evil, and tempting if not compelling him to keep back the truth, as the only price of peace. For this reason, our growth in numbers has far exceeded our growth in deep and thorough knowledge of the Constitution, the ritual system, the sacred powers, gifts, and peculiar genius of the Church, to which we profess our adherence in the Creed. And where this knowledge is not found, and a desire for it neither formed nor cherished, it is simply impossible that there should be that hearty love and indomitable zeal, which we always see where the magnificent image of the Church, as transmitted to us from the beginning, is imprinted on men's minds. And even where the theory of the Church is tolerably well understood, a multitude of side-influences often crowd in, which are too feebly resisted to disarm them of their noxious effect on the mind of the Church. Thus, we may see, that while there is abundant life among us, and every appearance of progress and increase, yet it does not commonly bear the true and unmistakable stamp of *Church* life, or *Church* progress, as the Apostles and ancient Saints would have understood those words. Our ways of thinking, writing, speaking, and legislating, take too much of a secular and unecclesiastical form. Our plans and modes of action are oftentimes formed on models belonging to our own age, and not strictly true to the instinct and the spontaneous effort of the Church itself. We fail, sometimes sadly, in keeping close to the originality of the Church, except in certain features which do not admit of modification. An inferior element has been gradually creeping in, and claiming alliance with that which is Divine. Dress has been allowed to mingle with the fine gold; and hence, a diminution both of strength and beauty, and an incapacity for such vast and Godlike movements, — such brilliant displays of majesty, Church life, and power, — as once awed the nations, and seemed to shake the very earth.

It is time, surely, that in her missionary work, and in her advances elsewhere and everywhere, the Church should throw off all reserve, and announce herself, as in those days of old, when she went forth with such daring zeal and triumphant faith. Millions are now waiting for the Church, and inquiring: "Who will

show us any good?" As a sect, they need her not. As an Episcopal "denomination," she will not meet the conscious yearnings of their souls for the certainty of an infallible Faith. As a Church among the Churches of modern formation, she will offer but a temporary and precarious shelter from the furious and unrelenting storm of unbelief which even now threatens to burst on the land. But as the citadel of the Great King, built on the Rock of Ages, she offers a refuge to which all the tribes of the earth may flee, and a security which no enemy shall ever invade and destroy.

We feel justified in calling the attention of our readers to the advertisement on the first page of advertisements.

The pipe here noticed seems to supply a long desired want. And we have reason to believe that wherever its use is adopted post mortem examinations will not bring a verdict of — died from poison of lead-pipe.

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

THE RIGHTFUL HEIR. A Drama in Five Acts. By the Author of "*Rich-
elieu*," "*The Lady of Lyons*," etc. New York: Harper & Brothers.
1868.

Sir Guy de Malpas, in this admirable Drama, is a poor cousin, who, in certain contingencies, will be translated from poverty to an earldom. Lady Montreville is an imperious yet noble nature, hardened into worldliness by intense suffering, whose affections are all concentrated upon Lord Beaufort, her second son, and the hope of her house. Vyvyan was the child of her youth and love, exposed to a most cruel fate, to save his brother's title. Eveline is a pure, lovely, innocent girl, whose image is inscribed on the hearts of both the sons of Lady Montreville. The meanness of the contemptible De Malpas, the dashing, manly courage of the noble Vyvyan, the youthful pride, and instinctive recoil of Lord Beaufort, the struggle in the breast of the haughty and majestic mother between the child of her girlish love, and the child of her age's hope, are portrayed with high dramatic power. The language and the sentiments have the true tragic elevation. The plot often evinces a consummate skill. The characters are admirably preserved. There are everywhere lines of poetic beauty which touch the heart and linger in the memory. How terrible the description of Vyvyan's exposure on the sea: —

"Noon glaring came — with noon came thirst and famine;
And with parched lips I called on death, and sought
To wrench my limbs from the stiff cords that gnawed
Into the flesh, and drop into the deep;
And then — the clear wave trembled, and below
I saw a dark, swift-moving, shapeless thing,
With watchful, glassy eyes — the ghastly shark

Swam hungering round its prey — then life once more
 Grew sweet; and with a strained and horrent gaze
 And lifted hair, I floated on, till sense
 Grew dim, and dimmer."

But we must conclude our notice with a more pleasing picture. The following we regard as one of the most beautiful descriptions of woman's love in our language. It falls from the lips of the sweet, true, affectionate Eve-line:—

" These could give
 To me no bliss, save as they blest thyself.
 Into the life of him she loves, the life
 Of woman flows, and never more reflects
 Sunshine or shadow on a separate wave.
 Be his lot great, for his sake she loves greatness;
 Humble, a cot with him is Arcady!
 Thou art ambitious! thou wouldst arm for fame:
 Fame then fires me, and without a tear,
 I bid thee go where fame is won — as now.
 Win it, and I rejoice! but fail to win —
 Were it not joy to think I could console?"

This is the language of a true woman's love. When we consider Sir Edward Bulwer's success as a novelist, as a dramatist, and as a reviewer, he seems to us among the most gifted men of a generation producing the learned and brilliant Macaulay. We recognize in no other person greater versatility of genius combined with polished excellence. The only defect in his poetry is, that it is sometimes more an art than an inspiration. He writes verse because he *can*, rather than because he *must*. Had he to choose between the poem and the novel, we fear the muse would be sacrificed. Therefore, while often next below Shakespeare, he has never reached that highest region where *consecrated* Genius alone soars.

THE NEW ENGLAND TRAGEDIES. By HENRY WADSWORTH LONGFELLOW. I. JOHN ENDICOTT. II. GILES COREY OF THE SALEM FARMS. Boston: Ticknor & Fields. 1868.

If the nightingale which had soothed us with soft melodies into delicious dreams, should abandon her warblings to the moon, and in the glare of the sun, try an impossible strain, the unfortunate attempt could only excite pain. We should recall with tears the music of the night, and turn in haste from the mistaken songster. We feel very much thus with regard to Mr. Longfellow. Many of his poems are exquisite in sentiment, in rhythm, in structure. They are enshrined in the hearts and memories of thousands. They have become, perhaps, immortal in American literature. His *Evangeline* and his *Hiawatha* we always thought departures from the true circle of his genius, where, however, poverty in poetic imagery and dramatic interest, were pardoned in view of the perfection of the versification, and the simplicity of the scenes and characters. But when Mr. Longfellow passes into the region of tragedy, he at once stands exposed. Here are required glow, elevation, intensity, rapidity, power. In all these elements of Poetry our author is deficient. His domain is the pleasing, the simple, the cultured, the refined. Beyond his sphere he sinks into most painful mediocrity. But his present attempt is unfortunate in every respect — unfortunate in selection, unfortunate in theme, unfortunate in scene, unfortunate in taste, unfortunate in style. In fact the

bare, naked, icy, forbidding, Puritan life has nothing to move the tuneful sympathies of the Muse. She shrinks in recoil from its spirit as she would from a jagged cliff, or a frozen ocean. While recognizing its heroic element, she is chilled and darkened by its cold and gloom. Besides, historic tragedy must have her majestic march through periods sufficiently distant in the past, to give freedom to imagination. We can conceive nothing more uncongenial to her nature than the calculating cruelties of fanatical Puritanism. It is not therefore wonderful that Mr. Longfellow in his present volume never rises above a prosaic mediocrity, unrelieved by the slightest poetic glow, and unredeemed by a frequent exquisiteness of rhythmical structure. But most painful and marvelous of all, that New England's poet should have introduced into his New England tragedies, the most common phrases of New England slang. Nothing but stern, critical justice could compel us thus to speak concerning a venerable American writer, many of whose effusions will live in American Literature.

THE PRE-COLUMBIAN DISCOVERY OF AMERICA, BY THE NORTHMEN.

Illustrated by Translations from the Icelandic Sagas. Edited with Notes and a general Introduction. By B. F. DeCosta. Albany: Joel Munsell. 1868.

This book is a very singular and valuable addition to American literature; singular for its subject and its substance, and valuable for the new and clear light it throws upon the question, Who first discovered America? It undertakes to prove how ages before Columbus sailed from Spain, the Norsemen not only discovered America, but that at divers times divers of them touched North America, sailed into its bays, explored its woods, gathered its grapes and corn, and furs and fish, traded and fought with its aboriginal inhabitants, built houses or huts, brought their wives there, and in short, explored certain regions of its sea-coasts with great minuteness and industry. And strange to say, the region which they most frequented was that to which the New England Puritans first came near eight hundred years later — Cape Cod, and along its southern coast to the Rhode Island bays. All this Mr. De Costa not only affirms, but establishes beyond question. He proves it from those ancient Sagas or songs of the Northmen, wherein they repeated from age to age the heroic deeds of their ancestors, and which are now preserved in the great libraries of Northern Europe. These Sagas, which treat of these discoveries, it may here be said, are the songs of a childlike, credulous, superstitious, simple-hearted race of men, who yet had the toughest heads for a sea voyage into the unknown, and the toughest courage in a battle where man stood against man.

But who were these Northmen; and how did they come to America? To be obliged to either ask or answer these questions is an accusation of History. For the Historic Muse, like every other female, has a strain of caprice and prejudice running through her behavior. She has narrowed herself within certain isothermal lines, and shut her eyes to what lies beyond. She has had a shade of Epicureanism about her, and sooth to say, has never liked the cold. From the temperate lines down to the equator, she has writ of men; but towards the poles she has left races to go their own way, "unhonored and unsung." She has told us of Isis, and Belus, Nineveh and the Nile, Cæsar and Cambyases, but not much of Thor and Odin, Novgorod and Iceland, and the great sea kings and berserkers who swept stormily over so many seas

and realms in a singular mastery of courage and strength. We teach our children of Greece and Rome, and the races who dwelt around the Mediterranean, but how much do boys or men amongst us know of the Northmen? Yet in many respects they are the most singular and dominant of races; and are our blood kin. Their religion was one of the most grotesque, gigantic, stormy creeds that ever challenged the faith of mankind; and has left its mark upon our every-day common English speech. They never excelled in the arts, yet the remains of their temples are to this present hour. They established among themselves a government in some ways despotic, and yet it left them not only among the freest of peoples, but it maintained by its genius liberty, when it would have died in the keeping of more pliant races. The British Parliament and the American Congress are, in a fair use of historical truth, their children. But the sea was the Northman's empire, and his ships his castles. Building these ships in his Norwegian, or Swedish, or Danish forests, he sailed out of port to assail and ravage Europe. He invaded England, and in the bloodiest of forays subdued again and again the English people. He conquered from France its fair province of Normandy, and filled Paris and the French kings with terror. He invaded Spain, Italy, Africa; seized Sicily, assailed Rome, and his sword ruled at Constantinople. Everywhere ships could go he went; everywhere men could fight he conquered. His is one of the most singular races in all the ages. Yet the Norseman always preferred his North. He loved its austere summer fields, and to see the ice melt into the cool rivulets that fed the violets in spring. He loved its scant harvests, its stormy days, its long winter nights, when his comrades gathered around the blazing hearth with wassail and song to recount ancient deeds, or to plan future victories. But above all he loved the sea, and to feel it heave his ship, when with its one vast square sail it plunged through the waves, and the white foam wet him, hungry, and strong, and valiant. Without fear, and careless of life, he was not gentle or philanthropic; but he was brave, constant, with no infirmity of will, a rough, gigantic sea-soldier, and his blood is this very day in the nations who dominate the world. There was Norse blood in Nelson, in Collingwood, in Farragut.

The way of the discovery of America by the Northmen was this. They sailed to and discovered Iceland, and colonized it. Of this mysterious, wonderful land, volcano under the eternal ice of its great hills; with its rocky, frozen fields, and its boiling geysers; with its ancient learning and its simple, but brave and remote domestic life, the student of such things knows much that interests and teaches him. From Iceland he sailed to Greenland, and on its southern and western coasts also planted colonies. Thence in due time, urged by his uncontrollable hunger of discovery, and guided only by such dim tokens of the western world as he found in the drift that lodged on the Greenland coast, some Norseman sailed away to the south and west, while his comrades on shore expected his return. Sometimes they waited in vain; and sometimes after months or years, they saw him sail into port and anchor. Then he told his story. He had found western land, some snowy, mountainous, some flat, some bare, some wooded. He had met wild men of a race he had never seen before. They had shot arrows at him; part of his men had been killed by them, and there had been great fishing westward. He brought back much news, and no great gain. Perhaps the glory satisfied him, and he remained at home, or he went another voyage. Years after, some countrymen of his, restless for discovering and keeping well in mind the words of the old voyager, went the same way and had the same fortune.

Thus through many years these men every now and then explored American territory, making no boast to Europe, nor thinking they had done any great thing. It was Columbus who opened America to Europe, but the Northmen first discovered it.

Mr. De Costa has told the story of their discoveries with much tact, simplicity, and research. He has modestly kept himself behind his picture; but the few who are acquainted with him, know him to be a skillful student of ancient things, and with a singularly unique and charming style in relating them. Sooner or later men will find him another Thoreau, with the Christian faith in him. He has merited well of American scholarship, and we predict for him a brilliant future in his chosen studies.

SERMONS BY HENRY WARD BEECHER, Plymouth Church, Brooklyn. Selected from published and unpublished discourses, and revised by their author. In two volumes. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1868.

These volumes reveal both the weakness and the strength of Mr. Beecher. They certainly evince an intellect of unusual force and richness, a heart susceptible of pious emotions, a life-purpose decided and striking. Only a man of genius could for so many years attract vast audiences, and wield such an immense influence over the public. If the discourses composing these volumes are less vivid in fancy than the usual productions of Mr. Beecher, they are also more serious and solid. They abound in striking thoughts, forcible expressions, and earnest appeals. There is less of the flash of popular eloquence than we expected. Still we think discoverable in the career of Mr. Beecher two great errors—the one practical, and the other theological. In regard to the first, he seems from the beginning to have above all things detested empty benches. He evidently resolved to draw the multitude to his ministry. He studied man in his ordinary relations, and accommodated himself to human nature. This, within proper limits, was to follow the example of the Saviour. But, when eccentricities are indulged on system, when wit is cultivated, when men are educated to expect that the pulpit will excite their risibilities, it may be doubted whether audiences are not increased at the expense of Religion. If Mr. Beecher urges in defense his success in attracting the multitude, Rome might, on the same ground, justify her magnificent ceremonial. The theological error is, however, far more serious than the practical. It seems to underlie the author's entire life. It affects all his discourses. It colors his whole career. The fault to which we allude is a misconception of the atonement. Mr. Beecher represents the sacrifice of the Cross as more intended to exhibit the Divine Love than satisfy the Divine Justice. Certainly, when viewed in the light of the Old Dispensation, its pervading principal purpose was *expiation*. In the suffering victim of the altar was no trace of mercy. Everything displayed *atonement*. So the Baptist introduced Jesus as the "Lamb of God, who taketh away the sin of the world," to indicate that *sacrifice* was his great office. And while the Scripture does not reveal *how* the Divine merit of our Redeemer satisfies Eternal Justice, it does affirm the fact that it was designed to "declare the righteousness of God, that He might be just, and the Justifier of him that believeth in Jesus." The words of our Lord on the Cross, "It is finished," unquestionably referred to His completed *expiation*. In the Orthodox Fathers, and in our own Liturgy, the great purpose of Christ's death is represented as *atonement*. The infinite Love displayed on the Cross is the great motive employed in drawing men to repentance and faith; but first in its grand

conception is *satisfied justice*. When this order is inverted, the pulpit loses its spiritual power, and degenerates into a weak sentimentalism. Mr. Beecher, from his view, discoursing on the Love of God, is feeble where he should be strong. He seems talking merely to move popular sensibility. He lacks unction. The stream of his eloquence rather mirrors flowers than bears along to eternal realities. We believe with truer conceptions of the guilt of infringed Law, with more correct views of the atoning aspects of our Redeemer's death, with a higher regard for the Church as a Divine Institution, there would have been imparted to his bright genius a seriousness and a solidity, which would have rendered it, if less brilliant in time, far more fruitful for eternity.

MORAL USES OF DARK THINGS. By HORACE BUSHNELL. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1868.

Perhaps no American writer unites more perfectly the philosophical and the poetical than Dr. Bushnell. His intellect grasps great truths, which his fancy depicts with the glow of vivid imagery. His intuitions are, however, stronger than his logical faculty. He relies more on the perceptions of his genius than the slower processes of his reason. Therefore, in his "Sermons for the New Life," on all topics which required breadth and power, rather than analysis and argument, he is unsurpassed, even by Chalmers. His style exhibits a marvelous grace and beauty, and he sometimes carries you into lofty regions of thought, where he soars majestically on a kingly wing. But when he approaches theological questions, such for instance as free will and responsibility, he is an eagle limping on the earth instead of flying amid the clouds. The contrast is painful, and marvelous. In the present volume, however, the peculiar genius of Dr. Bushnell has free scope. He discusses nothing theologically. He is brought into immediate contact with the universe, and catches its inspiration. His penetration into the secret teachings of nature is extraordinary, while his brilliant imagination spreads over his pictures colors bright, but never glaring. The universe, so wonderfully adapted to man's physical nature, has yet its highest significance in connection with his moral, his spiritual, his immortal being. It was contrived to furnish all images to express the relations of humanity both to time and to eternity. In this view we discover the most profound depths of the Divine Wisdom. Perhaps no man living, more readily than Dr. Bushnell, could bring from the vast storehouses of nature hidden truths, and interpret them to our consciousness in a style at once truthful, luminous, and beautiful. His book sparkles with gems of thought. He touches the most familiar things, and we at once see them in new and instructive relations. His reflections are so truthful and so natural, that we forget that they are original. In some parts of his essays, there is a slight looseness of style, unusual in so careful and polished a writer. This, however, is a small speck on a bright surface. We have scarcely ever read an American book which has opened more fully to our view the great secrets of the moral universe, and can only regret that the theology of Dr. Bushnell, like that of Mr. Beecher, rests upon an imperfect basis, since it reverses the Divine order of the atonement, making first its exhibition of the Divine Love instead of its satisfaction of the Divine Justice. However, we can be profited, and delighted, with the wealth of genius lavished over the superstructure of the edifice, even when we may suspect the solidity of the foundation.

PROBLEMS OF THE AGE, WITH STUDIES IN ST. AUGUSTINE, ON KINDRED TOPICS. By the Rev. AUGUSTINE F. HEWIT, of the Congregation of St. Paul. New York: The Catholic Publication Society, 126 Nassau Street. 1868.

This is a most singularly inconsistent and illogical book. But it is authority rather than argument which usually characterizes the Romanist. In our apprehension, nothing can be more unsatisfactory than the efforts of Mr. Hewit to explain by the theories of his Church the difficulties of the Divine administration. Certainly the damnation of all unbaptized infants does not gild the dark clouds which hang over our world. Millions of beings, who have never consciously sinned, without the possibility of the holy rite, sinking into eternal fire, unbenefited by the atonement of the Saviour, or the grace of the Holy Spirit! If this were truth, however terrible, taught by the Scripture, our faith would embrace it, although inexplicable to reason. But we will not receive it on the authority of Mr. Hewit, or the Romish Church. We indeed believe that baptism regenerates the child, endues him with the Holy Ghost, and translates him into the higher privileges and responsibilities of the Christian covenant; but never can forget that where there is no personal sin, the death of the second Adam is coextensive in its results with the transgression of the first Adam, and that in this sense, "the free gift has come upon *all* men unto justification of life."

Mr. Hewit endeavors to show that St. Augustine everywhere expressed the views of the Romish Church. But why does he accept his teaching in regard to purgatory, and reject his teaching in regard to predestination? If his authority is to settle the questions of transubstantiation and sacrifice, why will it not settle the questions of the liberty of man and the decrees of God? If I must accept his views touching prayers for the dead, simply because they have the weight of his venerable name, why must I not accept his views touching every doctrinal dogma? Mr Hewit, to be consistent, must be willing to receive the *whole* of Augustinism. Yet, in fact, he repudiates all that most strongly characterizes the system of the Bishop of Hippo, only approving what is peculiarly Romish.

See what Mr. Hewit says of Calvinism. He regards it "as the most irrational form of Christianity." It "has done, and is doing more to generate antipathy to Christianity than any other cause." It "is a travesty of one side of a Christian doctrine." Nor do we deny these assertions. But see what he says of Augustinism. He remarks in regard to the great master: "It is well known that he taught the doctrine, that God has chosen from among those who are justified by baptism in the Church a certain number, who are predestined to perseverance and eternal life, and who therefore receive a grace, infallibly efficacious in its own nature, by which their perseverance is secured, the rest being left destitute of grace." Surely the doctrine of Carthage is here as objectionable as that of Geneva, and has even an additional shade of gloom, and we cannot see how Mr. Hewit can, in this particular, so harshly denounce Calvin, and so gently touch Augustine; or why he should repudiate his peculiar system of theology, and yet plead his authority in regard to Romish views of baptism, the Eucharist, and prayers for the dead. In fact, only the Apostolic Fathers were purely Scriptural, and when we reach the period of the mighty Bishop, with great veneration for particular writers, and peculiar regard for their admitted *consensus*, we can yet rely only implicitly on the authority of Ecumenical

Councils, acting under the promised presence of the Holy Ghost in the Church, in the interpretation of the essential truths of the Divine Oracles.

THE LIFE OF GEORGE STEPHENSON, AND OF HIS SON, ROBERT STEPHENSON, comprising also a History of the Invention and Introduction of the Railway Locomotive. By SAMUEL SMILES, Author of "Self Help," "The Huguenots," etc., with Portraits and numerous Illustrations. New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, Franklin Square. 1868.

The wooden railway and steam locomotion were known long before the time of George Stephenson. Like Watt with the steam-engine, it was his vocation to make what was a curious experiment, or a rude attempt, a practical success. His work was effectually achieved against the greatest difficulties. The ignorant young stoker studied the lesson for the night amid the glare of his furnace, and the rattle of his machinery, and converted himself first into an intelligent engineer, and then into an inventive mechanic. He was full of English manhood. His practical sagacity, at least in view of its results, was sublime. There is scarcely anything in history more thrilling than Stephenson's completion of the Liverpool and Manchester Railway, and the trial of the "Rocket." We can see this marvelous machine, hissing and panting before gazing thousands, and seeming to concentrate within its fiery frame the future of the world. Its rivals have failed. Expectation is intense. Multitudes stare in silence. The puffing "Rocket" at first glides slowly. It moves faster! faster!! faster!!!—finally rushing over the earth at a speed which makes men breathless. The great practical question of the age is settled, and George Stephenson is a Railway King. This sturdy Englishman, who, with his gifted son, stood almost alone against the world, in defense of the locomotive, as he flies at the rate of thirty-five miles an hour on the "Rocket," is more truly a conqueror, than was Cæsar crowned with laurel on the Capitol before assembled Rome. A relic from England's most victorious battle-fields should not be more prized than that locomotive. Then how marvelous the achievements of Robert Stephenson in constructing the tubular bridges over the Straits of Menai, and the river St. Lawrence! How original the conception! How bold the plan! How admirable the execution! Every locomotive thundering over these unrivaled bridges proclaims the immortality of the father and the son. Mr. Smiles, in recording their achievements and their virtues, has conferred a blessing on the world. His plain and unpretending, but most interesting and satisfactory volume, exhibits equal judgment and research. It should be read by every young man in America. We confess his description of the triumph of the "Rocket" produced tears of excited joy, such as never flowed over a romance. After all, fact is nobler than fiction, and the practical successes of manly common sense are among the highest achievements of the human intellect.

JESUS CHRIST, HIS TIMES, LIFE, AND WORK. By E. D. PRESSENSE, D.D. Second Edition revised. New York: Scribner, Welford, & Co. 1868.

The French mind is rather intuitive than logical. Its perceptions are quick, its sensibilities are acute, its impressions are vivid. The errors of M. Remy are only its exaggerations. His dreamy sentimentalism and brilliant imagination are almost a national inheritance. Nowhere on earth, but from

Paris, could his fascinating, his delusive volumes have proceeded. He throws over his subject a delicious French haziness everywhere gilded with sentiment and fancy, until reason is bewildered amid a certain dreamy voluptuousness. Perhaps only a Frenchman could meet his peculiarities in the apprehensions of his own countrymen, and no living author could have better succeeded than De Pressensè. His style is chaste, vivid, beautiful. He is never dull. His descriptions are often admirable, and his thoughts striking and original. His book is most interesting. Every Christian may read it with edification. Yet it is often deficient in that compact argument and satisfying detail which are more congenial to the English mind.

To show the charming style of Dr. Pressensè, we will give two quotations, the one referring to the Gospel, and the other to the Revelation, of St. John. "In the city of Ephesus appears a Gospel, which answers to all the requirements of this condition of the age, a Gospel which in its very prologue sets the true Christ of the Church in opposition to the Christ of Oriental Gnosticism, in which the history of Jesus is invested with the charms of a tender mysticism, in which the contest between the powers of good and evil forms the very basis of the narrative, in every page of which words of pathos touch the heart to its depths, in which more than one trait of marvelous exactness reveals the ocular witness, — a Gospel, in short, in which the whole disposition of events is so perfect, that it at once commends itself to the mind."

Again: "If there was one Apostle called more than another to preserve the loftiest and tenderest tones of the teaching of Christ, that one was surely the beloved disciple. The first time he broke his long silence, men seemed to hear again the voice of ancient Prophecy. It was just after the fearful persecution of Nero, on the rock of Patmos, that John wrote the epopeia of martyrdom. He recounted the sufferings and proclaimed the triumph of the wounded and bleeding Church, and this he did, not as a Jew, narrow and infatuated in his prejudices, but as a disciple of that New Covenant which embraces all the nations of the earth. He borrowed nothing from ancient Prophecy but its tongue of fire to proclaim the divine judgments. The Son of Thunder reappears in these terrible pages, but we mark also the disciple, the worshipper of Jesus who is presented to us at once as the Lamb slain, and as the Word of God, the Eternal One before whom the whole Heavens bow. Under this dazzling drapery, it is the true heart of John which beats — that deep tender heart, vehement alike in its love and its reprobation."

JESUS OF NAZARETH; HIS LIFE AND TEACHINGS: Founded on the Four Gospels, and illustrated by reference to the Manners, Customs, Religious Beliefs, and Political Institutions of his times. By LYMAN ABBOTT, with Designs by Doré, De Laroche, Fenn, and others. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1869.

Conybeare and Howson, in their wonderful work on St. Paul, opened a new path of Scriptural Biography. They filled up the Biblical outline of the great Apostle's life, not from fancy or conjecture, but from ascertained facts of ethnology, geography, and history. Their achievements are really marvelous. St. Paul stands before you in new aspects. His biography palpitates with life. His training at Tarsus, his education at Jerusalem, his voyages over the Mediterranean, his visits to the Churches, pass before your view with the

vividness of a picture. You see his form, you hear his voice as he discourses at Athens beneath the flashing image of Minerva, and amid the immortal shapes of the Agora. You behold him as a living presence while he bears his testimony in the Forum, previous to laying his head upon that block which was his last step to Heaven. We have wished, ever since reading this noble work, that biographies of Moses and of Christ could be written on the same principles. In regard to our Divine Saviour, our desire has been at least partially gratified by an able American writer. Mr. Abbott has everywhere exhibited a spirit of faithful research in his endeavors to produce a living history of our adorable Lord. He has wisely avoided the preliminary arguments which encumber the excellent work of Pressensè, and usually confined himself to facts rather than followed conjecture. His introductory descriptions of Judea are exceedingly instructive and graphic. Indeed, the whole volume is suggestive, learned, and readable. We only regret that Mr. Abbott, in recounting the commission of the Holy Apostles, and the shaping of the Christian Dispensation, did not have our higher views of the continuity and authority of the Church as a Divine institution. It seems to us also that the work might be almost indefinitely enlarged, for the perusal of scholars as well as the instruction of the people. Far from indorsing all the particular views of the volume, we yet very cordially commend it as a whole. We append the following lively description of an ancient Jewish lady in her full costume. "Though there was not in the days of Christ a glass window in all Palestine, there was not a house without a mirror made of polished metal. The dress of the poor varied from that of the rich only in the cost, scarcely in the amount, of ornamentation. A modern belle, looking on her Jewish prototype, might certainly lament the degeneracy of the age. To the ear-rings of modern times she added a ring in the nose. The single bracelet of to-day is all that is left of the armlets which literally covered her arms from the shoulder to the wrist. The cosmetics secretly applied are a substitute for the paint with which she ornamented her face with as little secrecy as the modern belle employs in adding to her hair. Pins sparkling with precious stones gathered her loose and flowing robes into folds about her neck and bust. Rings loaded down her hand, whose whiteness was outdazzled by their brilliancy. Chains of gold, with pearls and emeralds attached, hanging from the neck, bore no watch, indeed, but some sacred amulets. Manacles of the same precious metal, chained together, compelled the mincing gait which the modern belle has to study, while tinkling ornaments pendent from it made it literally true that she had music wherever she went. In her hand she carried the curiously wrought handkerchief still carried, and the box of perfumery which her successor leaves upon the toilet-table."

We conclude with expressing our astonishment that in the very first sentence of the book, Palestine is described as on the "*Western* border of the Mediterranean Sea." It is to be regretted, also, that Mr. Abbott has, like M. Pressensè, indulged speculations in regard to our Saviour, bold almost to irreverence.

THE LIFE OF JOHN CARTER. By FREDERICK JAMES MILLS. With Illustrations. New York: Published by Hurd & Houghton. Cambridge: Riverside Press. 1868.

Nothing is so interesting as the spectacle of mind pursuing great objects

amid great obstacles. It is thus, indeed, is developed that immortal vigor which demonstrates that Spirit is not the result of mere physical organism. Where, with increase of power in the intellect and the will, is also a visible growth in the moral graces, not only is admiration excited, but also sympathy. Perhaps nowhere in the history of mind are the heart and head more moved than by the modest struggles of John Carter, against difficulties seemingly insurmountable. At the age of twenty-one, after a tavern revel, he had a midnight fall from a tree, which he mounted to rob a rook's nest. He was brought home paralyzed from his neck to his feet, and was ever afterwards incapable of motion in limb or body. Misfortune brought reflection, repentance, and at last, faith in his Saviour. His spirit first submitted, and then triumphed. From the death of nature there was a harvest of grace. The patient sufferer conceived the plan of drawing by means of a pencil held in his mouth. His very first attempt was successful, and he soon acquired a marvelous facility which evinced the inspiration of genius. The boldness, the accuracy, the finish of his sketches, are wonderful. After fourteen years of quiet and happy labor, a second accident completed the work of the first, and his spirit was translated to the scenes of light, and beauty, and glory, where his body will never again suffer a pang, or prove an encumbrance. Every Christian will be benefited by reading this touching story of struggling genius, made lovely in suffering and in victory, by the grace of the Holy Spirit.

THE HUMAN INTELLECT, with an Introduction upon Psychology and the Soul. By NOAH PORTER, D. D., Clark Professor of Moral Philosophy and Metaphysics, in Yale College. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1868.

This large work is rather a cyclopedia than a system. It embraces the accumulations of Dr. Porter's Professorship in Yale College. While admirable for reference, we are surprised that it is not better adapted to the practical wants of the student, especially as it proceeds from a most learned instructor. But whatever its merits as a text-book, there cannot be a question touching its usefulness to the scholar. It is really a treasure of knowledge on Psychology, such as could only be completed by long years of laborious research and patient reflection.

We subjoin extracts containing the substance of Dr. Porter's answer to Mill's view of "Causation," and Hamilton's theory of the "Unconditioned."

He says: "Do we gain our first knowledge of *Causation* from the experience of our personal causality? We answer, Yes! The soul cannot act without distinguishing the *ego* from its acts and their products. It knows itself to be the actor or originator of its active states. In this conscious exercise of its own active energy it has its first knowledge and individual exemplification of the causal energy in general. It has a direct knowledge of the terms or objects concerned, namely, the agent and the result. It has experience of effort or action in varying degrees. It has also experience of the feeling of pleasure and pain, which attends the efforts in question. Its belief of the acting of other causes external to itself, whether of spirit upon matter or matter upon spirit, is in contrast with this knowledge, incomplete in respect both to the terms or objects concerned, and their relations to one another."

He remarks: "But though we have a real and proper knowledge of the

'absolute,' we can by no means have an adequate and exhaustive, or what is often called an absolute knowledge of it. An absolute knowledge of all the relations of an individual object, a mass of rock, a tree, an animal, or a man, implies a complete mastery of all the relations which each holds to every other object in the universe, in respect to its properties and ends, — in other words, an exhaustive knowledge of the universe itself. The most sagacious and wide-reaching philosopher does not pretend to have attained such knowledge. Does the fact that these relations are ideally infinite, prove that they will, in fact, ever be mastered by any finite intellect? If not, then, in the finite, there is to the man the as yet *unmastered, and, perhaps, the unmasterable, and that is to him infinite*. In both the finite and infinite there is a common mystery which cannot be overcome, and that is the mystery of *self-existence*. Whether we transform the finite into the so-called infinite, by making of its powers and capacities of self-development an ideal absolute without intelligence or personality, or whether we accept as the real absolute a rational person, either must be self-existent."

"The absolute is a *thinking agent*. The universe is a *thought* as well as a *thing*. As fraught with design it reveals thought as well as force. The thought includes the origination of the forces and of their laws, as well as the combination and use of them. These thoughts must include the whole universe. It follows, then, that the universe is controlled by a single thought, or the thought of an individual thinker."

ADVENTURES IN THE APACHE COUNTRY. A Tour through Arizona and Sonora, with Notes on the Silver Regions of Nevada. By J. ROSS BROWNE, Author of "Yusef," "Crusoe's Island," "An American Family in Germany," "The Land of Thor." Illustrated by the Author. New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, Franklin Square. 1869.

A peculiar interest attaches to the mining regions of the West, not excited alone by their treasures of silver and of gold. We see there what human nature is, when its social and religious restraints are removed. Especially do we behold American character in its boldest, if not most pleasing features. The dress, the speech, the bearing of the people indicate a certain *abandon* in wickedness and in enterprise. The California stage-coach, dashing amid clouds of dust with running horses, down the steep mountain, along the verge of a fearful precipice, is a most vivid picture of the spirit of that adventurous region, where men often concentrate the last resources of an unfortunate or a wasted life, in one desperate effort to bear from the very depths of the earth treasures which will restore them to position, and perhaps luxury. Then the bloody vengeance of the Indian, and the grotesque manners of the Celestial, color both the tragic and the comic aspects of the picture. There is nothing weak or dwarfed in human character amid the boundless plains and the lofty peaks of that distant land of promise and of crime. To sketch its peculiarities requires a bold artist, and we do not know that any person is better qualified than the author of this volume, who unites in himself capacities both for pen and pencil. We have sometimes, in reading the work, been painfully reminded that the old days of that quiet humor, and delicate sentiment, and beautiful imagery, which graced the immortal pages of Irving, have vanished, and that we have in their place broad, rollicking fun, and powerful, but not refined description. Everything seems yielding to the dash of Young America.

GREATER BRITAIN: A Record of Travel in the English-speaking Countries during 1866 and 1867. By CHARLES WENTWORTH DILKE. With Maps and Illustrations. New York: Harper & Brothers, Franklin Square. 1869.

This volume is really founded on a great conception, which suggests vast thoughts connected with the past, the present, and the future of our world. The author's object was to visit all countries where the English language is spoken. We find him first viewing from the steamer the low works of Fortress Monroe. He is in Norfolk, in Richmond, in New York, in Cambridge, in Canada, in Cincinnati, in Michigan, in Denver, in Mormondom, in Virginia City, in San Francisco, in Mexico, in New Zealand, in Australia, in Hindostan — making his observations on negroes, Celts, Yankees, Indians, Celestials, the disciples of Brigham Young, the merchants of San Francisco, the adventurers of Hokitika, and the devotees of Benares. How wonderful, as we follow this sprightly and enterprising traveller, to reflect that the English language, and literature, and laws — propagating from the little island of Great Britain as a centre — have spread themselves to the circumference of the globe, exerting a mightier influence on the destinies of the race than ever proceeded from any country except Palestine. We admire the feeling of nationality which thus prompted the writer to keep along the path of his country's speech and enterprise, and yet notice but few traces of that proverbial prejudice seen in so many visitors from the land of our ancestors. Mr. Dilke has produced a sprightly and readable book, abounding in suggestive hints, and valuable information. If it does not always exhibit the culture of the quiet scholar, or the breadth of the professed philosopher, it is in harmony with the spirit of the age, and intended to be popular with the publishers and the public. Indeed, in style and dash, Mr. Dilke is not dissimilar from Mr. Browne. The American and the Englishman on the same themes, often exhibit the same peculiarities; and the habits of the mining adventurers in Colorado and Australia, have most strikingly the same characteristics. It seems quite clear that the dominant Saxon race is more willing to apply to *itself* the principles of political equality than extend them to the African, the Indian, the New Zealander, the Chinese, or the Hindostanee.

THEATRICAL MANAGEMENT IN THE WEST AND SOUTH FOR THIRTY YEARS, interspersed with Anecdotal Sketches, autobiographically given. By SOL SMITH, retired Actor, with fifteen Illustrations, and a Portrait of the Author. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1868.

We opened this volume — often coarse indeed, in style, but always genial in humor — with a brain somewhat clouded and oppressed by intense literary labors. Our dignity was soon disturbed with irresistible laughter, excited by the amusing accounts of the youthful Mr. Smith's adventures in Albany. On one occasion he concealed himself in a supposed box, which was intended for the coffin of a king, and having been borne over the stage amid the mock solemnities of a royal funeral pageant, he suddenly sprang from his concealment, terrifying the startled attendants, who all became pious, and one of them, a minister, ascribing his religious convictions to his theatrical alarm. We cannot commend the volume of Mr. Smith as a model of either culture or morality. It abounds, however, in many truthful descriptions of former

Western and Southern life, and humorous pictures, which provoke the quiet smile or the hearty laugh. The same ready wit and shrewd sense employed in some practical vocation, would have made Mr. Smith a man of position and influence in society; yet when we notice such an aptitude for the ludicrous, and remember how diversion often relieves an oppressed brain, we almost regret that the farce and the comedy are barred from Christianity by the indecencies and immoralities which have been their accompaniments in the theatre from the "Clouds" of Aristophanes to the Autobiography of Solomon Smith.

THE TRAGEDIAN. An Essay on the Histrionic Genius of Junius Brutus Booth. By THOMAS R. GOULD. New York: Published by Hurd & Houghton. Cambridge: Riverside Press. 1868.

Mr. Booth was certainly eminently endowed with the tragic genius. His voice, his person, his energy, all marked him as the successful candidate for histrionic success. He burned with the fire of the true actor. His magnetic power was resistless. In scenes of intense passion he was often sublime, and seldom surpassed. Yet we cannot believe with the author of this biography, that he was the equal of Garrick, who, uniting cultivation and genius, the comic and the tragic art, was the marvel of the English metropolis, at a time when Pope, and Johnson, and Burke were numbered among his enthusiastic admirers. Mr. Booth was deficient in that patient discipline which polished Macready into fame, and which has since made his own son the greatest ornament of the American stage. And here it may be remarked, when the Creator has endowed men with such distinguished genius for comic and tragic representation, and planted so deep in human nature a love of the dramatic, and graced literature with so many plays of distinguished merit, how it is to be regretted, that the temple of histrionic art should be almost invariably defiled by obscenities offensive at once to taste and morality! Yet should not Christianity despair to purify and elevate an agency which might wonderfully contribute both to the diversion and instruction of mankind.

RELIGION AND THE REIGN OF TERROR, or the Church during the French Revolution. Prepared from the French of M. EDMOND DE PRESSENSÉ Author of "*Histoire des trois premiers Siècles de L'Eglise chrétienne.*" "*Jésus Christ, son temps, sa vie, son œuvre,*" "*Le Pays de l'Evangile,*" and Editor of "*La Revue Chrétienne.*" By REV. P. LACROIX, A. M. New York: Carlton & Lanahan. 1869. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden.

M. Pressensé has here presented certain aspects of the French Revolution which deserve a separate consideration. His work is characterized by learning, by judgment, and by a certain vivid, graphic power which seem almost a peculiarity of the Frenchman. The vicissitudes of religion during the Reign of Terror, are not less marvelous than the individual histories and political changes of that period of blood and storm. The discussions in the Constituent Assembly in regard to the property of the Church have an intense interest, and the generous enthusiasm with which so many of the clergy surrendered their ancient rights and titles, evinced the utmost sincerity of purpose. However, they soon discovered their devotion to be rather an impulse of feeling than a dictate of reason, and that the popular wave was des-

tinged to overwhelm not only their order, but every vestige of religion. There is no darker page of the Revolution than that which describes the persecutions of the Ecclesiastics who refused submission to the tyranny of the Assembly, and it is greatly to the honor of the Roman Catholic Church, that so many of her clergy preferred poverty, exile, and death to a stain upon their conscience. During no period of their history have they ever appeared to greater advantage. The downward tendency to a cold Deism, and then to a dark, heartless, desolate Atheism, with the return of the nation under Napoleon to the old Faith and Worship, are most vividly described by M. Pressensé. Never was religion more entirely subjected to the will of a tyrant than by the Concordat forced by the Consul of France on the Pope of Rome. The noble spirit of liberty which breathes through this volume, is only equaled by our wonder that the present Emperor should have permitted it to escape the grasp of a power excited by apprehensions which always torture the oppressor. We can scarcely forbear concluding with an extract which will exhibit both the style and the boldness of Pressensé, —

"The soul itself of France is bound and hampered by the administrative network which guards it on every side, and nowhere allows free expression, either by word or association, to political belief, or to religious faith. This moral captivity enervates the nation, and will finally either turn its activity into pernicious and base channels, of which a vile literature is the surest sign, or plunge it into the terrible distraction of war. It is time to emancipate this noble and generous soul of France, and to free the giant from the innumerable fetters with which it is bound, as if it were asleep in the land of Lilliput. Such is the noble task, and the earnest aspiration of the true Liberalism of to-day."

Again : —

"We will close by repeating the noble thought of Mirabeau — God is as necessary as liberty for the French people. The great orator was too much the child of his era to give these words the whole of their significancy. It is for us who have seen what he did not see, and who know how precarious is that liberty which is viewed only as a human right; how prompt it is to grow feeble and venal — it is for us, the heirs and admirers of that great revolution which we desire to accomplish by correcting and repeating it, to declare again with the fullness of absolute conviction, that God is indeed as necessary as liberty to the French people. Nothing but the Divine idea can safeguard liberty, and the necessary condition of this effectual guardianship is, that liberty itself be regarded as of God. Everything, therefore, brings us back to this principle, — a free Church in a free state."

THE BIRD. By JULES MICHELET. With two hundred and ten Illustrations by Gracomelli. London : T. Nelson & Sons, Paternoster Row. Edinburgh and New York. 1868.

We have never read a book in which all the peculiarities of French genius more signally effloresce than in this volume. Here are seen what vivacity, what sensibility, what taste, what fancy, what exquisite, nay, almost painful sympathy with nature ! While on the other hand, what patient observation, what learned research, what philosophical suggestion ! How beautiful, also, to see the stern, manly genius of the historian softened and beautified by the womanly genius of his gifted wife ! Two souls, indeed, breathe through the volume. It glows with a masculine and feminine inspiration. We are reminded of some noble mountain seen through the mild glories of the evening. The tender French enthusiasm of Madame Michelet everywhere pervades, illumines, subdues the life, the style, the thoughts of her more philosophical husband. Nothing will more correct the growing coarseness of American

literature than the study of those pure, and graceful, and brilliant writings which are now adorning the higher departments of French literature.

If in this volume enthusiasm sometimes approaches a sentimentalism which almost provokes a smile, the fault will be overlooked, where there is so much scientific truth always beautified by genius, and often rising into eloquence. The illustrations of the volume are also admirable — bold, striking, original, yet never exceeding the limits of taste — while its mechanical preparation exhibits a high style of art. To show that we have not exaggerated, we will subjoin a few extracts.

How beautiful this description of the egg : —

"Understand that this little point which to you seems imperceptible, is an entire ocean — the sea of milk where floats in embryo the well-beloved of Heaven. It floats; fears no shipwreck; it is held suspended by the most delicate ligaments; it is saved from jar and shock. It swims all gently in the warm element, as it will swim hereafter in the atmosphere. A profound serenity, a perfect state in the bosom of a nourishing habitation."

How striking these thoughts from the chapter on the wing : —

"A life of ease, yet sublime! With what a glance of scorn may the weakest bird regard the strongest, the swiftest of quadrupeds — a tiger, a lion. The bird does not need to seek the air that he may be reinvigorated by touching it. The air seeks, and flows into him; it incessantly kindles within him the burning fires of life. It is this, and not the wing which is so marvelous. Take the pinions of the condor, and follow its track, when from the summit of the Andes, and the Siberian glaciers, it swoops down upon the glowing shore of Peru; traversing in a moment all the temperatures and all the climates of the globe, breathing at one breath the frightful mass of air, scorched, frozen, it matters not. You would reach the earth stricken as by thunder. Strength makes joy. The happiest of beings is the bird, because it feels itself strong beyond the limits of its action; because cradled, sustained by the breath of heaven, it floats, it rises without effort, like a dream. The boundless strength, the exalted faculty, obscure among inferior beings, in the bird is clear and vital, of deriving at will its vigor from the material source, of drinking in life at a full flood, — is a divine intoxication."

Here you have the lark : —

"She is the daughter of day. As soon as it dawns, when the horizon reddens, and the sun breaks forth, she springs from her furrow like an arrow, and bears to heaven's gate her hymn of joy, — hallowed poetry, fresh as the dawn, and gleeful as a childish heart." }

We conclude with the picture of the nightingale : —

"Artist! I have said the word, and I will not unsay it. He alone is creator; he alone varies, enriches, amplifies his song, and augments it by new strains. He alone is fertile and diverse in himself; other birds are so by instruction and imitation. He alone resumes — contains almost all — each of them, the most brilliant suggests a couplet to the nightingale. Only one other bird like him attains sublime results in the bold and simple. I mean the lark, the daughter of the sun. And the nightingale also is inspired by the light, so that when in captivity, alone and deprived of love, it suffices to unloose his song. Confined for a while in darkness, then suddenly restored to the day, he runs riot with enthusiasm, he bursts into hymns of joy. This difference, nevertheless, exists between the two birds: the lark never sings in the night; hers is not the nocturnal melody, the hidden meaning of the grand effects of even, the deep poesy of the shadows, the aspirations before dawn; in a word, that infinitely varied poem which translates and reveals to us, in all its changes, a heart brimful of tenderness. The lark's is the lyrical genius; the nightingale's the epic, the drama, the inner struggle; from thence a light apart. In deep darkness it looks into its soul, into love; soaring at times, it would seem, beyond the individual love, into the ocean of love infinite."

THE CONSCRIPT. A Story of the French War of 1813. By M. M. ERCKMANN CHATRIAN. Translated from the twentieth Paris edition, with eight full page Illustrations. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1869.

Here is a book which reminds us of that period in the distant past, when children were boys and girls, and not little men and women. How is it that a story of such sweet purity, and charming simplicity can emanate from Paris, a city always described as the type of whatever is artificial and immoral? Compare it with English and American tales which have the largest popularity with our youth! The contrast is both painful and humiliating. We commend this sprightly little volume to all parents who desire to provide suitable intellectual entertainment for their children.

THE CHILD WIFE. A Tale of the Two Worlds. By Captain MAYNE REID, Author of the "Scalp Hunters," etc. New York: Sheldon & Co., 498 and 500 Broadway. 1869.

Here we are afforded a speedy illustration of an assertion in our last notice, suggesting one of the most painful duties of the critic. Anything can be better overlooked than a betrayal of trust. The confidence reposed in those who educate and mould our children is invested with peculiar sacredness. When acquired, it involves a boundless responsibility. To wantonly blast it, is a crime. Perhaps no writer has exerted over the youth of America, and of England, a greater influence than Captain Mayne Reid. His tales have possessed a charm, almost a fascination for our children. Many of them, in their power to entertain, are rivals of the famous "Swiss Family Robinson," and the inimitable "Robinson Crusoe." Parents, overlooking a certain abrupt coarseness, occasional profanity, and the absence of a pious spirit, and and a true elevation, in their great desire to please their children, have permitted the works of this popular author free access to their families. They are found in the nursery, on the private shelf, in the public library. They are traced on the memories of our youth. They are written on their hearts. Scarcely any man would be hailed with more joy than Captain Reid by the girls and boys of America. They would vote him a statue, and crown it with flowers. We speak thoughtfully and conscientiously when we affirm that this esteem and confidence have been abused. What shall we say to a volume describing an evanescent physical passion arising from an accidental glance at the person of a bathing woman? What shall we say to a volume which introduces a disgraced and degraded soldier — drunkard, coward, bully, gambler, — who first sells his wife's honor, and then attempts her murder? What shall we say to a volume which depicts a licentious English nobleman, who grants a fraudulent title to conceal his own criminal amour? And this man has come to reside in our Republic, and to obtain the authority of its laws to corrupt its youth! We had better give letters patent to a flood, a famine, a pestilence. We invoke all Christian editors to procure the book, to examine it, and if they find these charges sustained, to drive it from society. We only fear that the poison is already in the minds of many youth, secretly and surely accomplishing its work of death.

GLEANINGS AMONG THE SHEAVES. By Rev. C. H. SPURGEON. Second Edition. New York: Sheldon & Co., 498 and 500 Broadway. 1869.

That many bright thoughts sparkle through this volume, is undeniable. Brilliance of intellect is everywhere visible. Such ideas, colored by the hues of fancy, and connected with the experiences of the heart, uttered with the manly voice of Mr. Spurgeon, and enforced by his fervid manner, could not fail to enchain his vast audiences, and make many excellent impressions. We doubt neither the sincerity nor the ability of the writer. Yet, in our apprehension, perhaps affected by some unconscious prejudice, Religion seems constantly employed for a certain oratorical effect. The flowers of the bouquet, the jewels of the casket, the pictures of the gallery, are artistically arranged to attract the eye, and please the taste. You do not seem in the presence of a man who, in view of the Cross, of Judgment, of Eternity, is preaching the Law, and proclaiming the Gospel only for your salvation. Read Taylor! For your soul's good flows that affluence of eloquence. Read South! That manly boldness, often rushing into coarseness, is to expose error, and defend truth. Read Wesley! Your false foundations are swept away that you may build on Christ. Read Whitfield! You are borne along a torrent which hurries you from self and time to your Saviour and eternity. And thus also with the great French orators — Bossuet, Bourdaloue, Massillon. You do not find the Ciceronian individualism, but the Demosthene self-oblivion. As with St. Paul, the man is nothing, — the Redeemer is everything. With all the genius and piety of Spurgeon, and of the gifted Beecher, there is an effort to impress, and a consciousness of success, greatly marring their power as pulpit orators. Such men need the influence, and the ordination of the Church.

THE UNNOTICED THINGS OF SCRIPTURE. By the Rt. Rev. WM. INGRAHAM KIP, D. D., Bishop of California, Author of the "Lenten Fast," "The Double Witness of the Church," "The Christmas Holidays in Rome," "The Early Conflicts of Christianity," "The Early Jesuit Mission in North America," "The Catacombs of Rome," etc., etc. New York. A. Roman & Co., San Francisco, 417 and 419 Montgomery Street. 1868.

Many years since, in a large and splendid volume, designed chiefly for American ladies, we read a most beautiful and brilliant description of Rome, as the imperial city appeared in those days when the gentle Cecilia and the patrician Valerian were martyrs for the Gospel. The impression will not soon be forgotten. A grace and vividness marked the style in harmony with the scene and subject. The same characteristics, subdued and softened, appear in the present volume. Many of the thoughts are familiar to theological students. But they discovered them in the cold, dry, technical discussions of ponderous treatises. Here they are seen in a succession of bright pictures — always shifting, and always interesting. The book will be at once popular and instructive. It is the result of much research and reflection, and will add to the reputation and the usefulness of the distinguished author. With some of the speculations of Bishop Kip we do not agree; but these are in regard to matters necessarily doubtful, and of minor importance. His book should have its place in the popular literature of the Church, and we hope it will be succeeded by many volumes of equal merit.

THE PARABLES OF OUR LORD EXPLAINED AND APPLIED. By Rev. FRANCIS BOURDILLON, M. D. New York: Carlton & Lanahan. Tract Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church, 200 Mulberry Street.

This is the first book we have ever read by a French author entirely destitute of those peculiarities which mark the French mind. That Gallic enthusiasm kindled by a Gallic sun amid Gallic scenes glows on no page, in no sentence, in no line of this volume. The method of treatment could give no opportunity for the wealth of learning, the sagacity of exposition, the originality of suggestion, the poetry of description, found in the unrivaled work of Archbishop Trench. The aim of the author was wholly practical. He has merely sought to express obvious thoughts in simple words. Viewed in reference to its unpretending object, the book deserves commendation, and may be more truly useful than works which abound in learned dissertation and brilliant description. The modest lamp is often preferred to the splendid chandelier.

THE GARDEN OF SORROWS, OR THE MINISTRY OF TEARS. By the Rev. JOHN ATKINSON. New York: Carlton & Lanahan. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden.

This book contains many pleasing, pious, and practical thoughts expressed in a style usually, but not always within the limit of a cultivated taste. The chapter on Religious Despondency is excellent. Among sincere Christians, much spiritual suffering unquestionably ensues from some aching nerve, or disordered organ. Indigestion may hide the cross. An oppressed brain may make a spiritual midnight. From a diseased heart may arise a shadow which obscures heaven. And just here is suggested a grand argument for the Liturgy of the Church. It expresses the deepest spiritual experiences, yet avoids that subjectivity of Calvinism which perplexed Brainerd, tormented Payson, and darkened Henry Martyn. It gives free play to the emotions, but never intensifies them into excitements followed by the flood of passion, the gloom of despair, and sometimes the cell of the lunatic, and the pistol of the suicide. Nothing so harmonizes the whole spiritual being, — at once cultivating fidelity to our duty, and hope of our immortality.

THE HISTORY OF THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH IN CONNECTICUT. FROM THE DEATH OF BISHOP SEABURY TO THE PRESENT TIME. By E. EDWARDS BEARDSLEY, D. D., Rector of St. Thomas' Church, New Haven. Vol. II. New York: Published by Hurd & Houghton. London: Sampson, Low, Son, & Marston. 1868.

To record the events of a Province, or a Diocese, requires some qualities superior to those needed for the history of a State, or of a Church. The interest of the work is chiefly local. Brilliancy of style is not expected. Extensive reputation is not possible. Great profit is not probable. Hence, the impulse of love must be the stimulus of the work. Industrious and impartial fidelity is the great requisite. In his historical labors, Dr. Beardsley seems thoroughly to have caught the spirit of his enterprise. His patience, his research, his modesty, deserve the greatest praise. He has rescued from oblivion facts which will make part of our Ecclesiastical History. The present volume, completing his labor of love, with the one already issued, entitle him to the gratitude of his Diocese in particular, and of the Church in general.

A TREATISE ON PHYSIOLOGY AND HYGIENE, FOR SCHOOLS, FAMILIES, AND COLLEGES. By I. C. DALTON, M. D., Professor of Physiology in the College of Physicians and Surgeons, New York, with Illustrations. New York : Harper & Brothers, Publishers. London : Sampson, Low, Son, & Marston. 1868.

It is fearful to contemplate a human body ! How marvelous the circulation of the blood ! How mysteriously delicate the entire system of the nerves ! How startling the whole intricate organism of the brain ! And then how intimately associated are all the processes of the body with the emotions, the passions, the intellect ! Hurry, vexation, care, anger, as surely disturb the physical system, and destroy health as excessive indulgence of the appetites. Temperance and quietude are indispensable to our largest and longest happiness and activity. But in this age — restless as the clicking telegraph made sensitive by electricity — rushing like a locomotive down a mountain — hissing, puffing, flying — with all its intense demands on our vital energies — how difficult to comply with the plain laws of our Creator ! It is not strange that instances of paralysis, lunacy, suicide, are so painfully multiplying. We must return to nature and reason, and it is cheering to see men of learning, like Dr. Dalton, turn aside from the more recondite professional studies, and write practical books unfolding the great laws of health to the people. Here we have a systematic volume, with plates, questions, glossary, and every convenience equally adapted to the private student, or the public school, containing invaluable suggestions, and all information in regard to health necessary to its preservation. But beyond these merely physical considerations, every Churchman, in the observance of our appointed services, would find that calm, that repose, that refreshment, which conduce to promote vigor, increase usefulness, and prolong life.

TOBACCO, AND ITS EFFECTS. A Prose Essay, showing that the Use of Tobacco is a Physical, Mental, Moral, and Social Evil. By HENRY GIBBONS, M. D., of San Francisco, California, Professor of Materia Medica in Toland Medical College, and Editor of the "Pacific Medical and Surgical Journal."

This is a well-prepared and interesting tract, presenting many facts and arguments to show that tobacco, under all circumstances, is an unmitigated evil. That nicotia, its chief ingredient, is an intense poison, is undeniable. When taken in large quantities it injuriously affects blood, voice, digestion, complexion, lungs, heart, nerves, brain, — the whole man, soul and body — besides producing certain annoyances not particularly agreeable to ladies, and all other persons unfortunately possessing delicate organisms. That total abstinence avoids all these injurious and inconvenient consequences, cannot be questioned. The same argument applies to alcoholic stimulants. But as there is in nature an abundant supply of these troublesome substances, and in man a universal propensity to their use, philosophic minds are vacillating between the doctrine, once so popular, of entire abnegation, and the older doctrine, and, we fear, yet more popular, of temperate indulgence. Our own opinions are in a state of scriptural suspension.

WILD LIFE UNDER THE EQUATOR, narrated for Young People. By PAUL DU CHAILLU, Author of "Discoveries in Equatorial Africa," "Stories of the Gorilla Country," etc., with numerous Engravings. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1869.

There is certainly everything in the writings of Du Chaillu to excite the interest of children. They associate the conception of the marvelous with Africa itself. From the earliest age, a species of mystery has attached to that unknown continent. It is not then wonderful that we should be thrilled by the narrations of a living man, who, beneath fiery suns, and in perilous regions, has seen those devouring ants, and insatiable cannibals — with lions, tigers, gorillas, elephants, crocodiles, hippopotami. There is a dash of adventure in these stories which also adds to their charm. It is a pleasure to commend the volumes of this sprightly author, who has purchased instruction and entertainment for our children by so much enterprise and danger.

AMERICAN EDITION OF DR. WILLIAM SMITH'S DICTIONARY OF THE BIBLE. Revised and edited by Professor H. B. HACKETT, D. D., with the Coöperation of EZRA ABBOT, A. M., A. A. S., Assistant Librarian of Harvard University. New York: 1868. Published by Hurd & Houghton. Parts XIV. and XV.

We will omit our usual quarterly commendation of this excellent work, issuing regularly in admirable form, from the Riverside Press, to carry its treasures of learning to so many libraries. It is grateful for Churchmen to remark that the writer on "The Lord's Day," places its universal observance by Primitive Christians on the same ground as Infant Baptism, and Episcopal Confirmation and Ordination. All are supported by the same arguments, drawn in the same way, from the same authorities. Together they stand or fall. The man who takes his infant to the font for Baptism, should, on his own principles, at the proper age, take it to the Bishop for Confirmation; and the man who substitutes the Christian Sunday for the Jewish Sabbath, if he is logically consistent, must believe in the three orders of the Ministry. The day, we think, is approaching in the history of our world, when sincere Denominationalism will perceive the force of truth, and return in all observance to Apostolic institution and example. Much as we are pressed in this number for space, we will quote the remarks of the writer to which we alluded in the first part of this notice: "But it may be observed that it is at any rate an extraordinary coincidence, that almost immediately we emerge from Scripture, we find the same day mentioned in a similar manner, and directly associated with the Lord's Resurrection; that it is a remarkable fact that we never find its dedication questioned or argued about, but accepted as something equally Apostolic with Confirmation, with Infant Baptism, with Ordination, or at least, spoken of the same way."

THE OLD WORLD IN ITS NEW FACE: IMPRESSIONS IN EUROPE IN 1867-68. By HENRY W. BELLOWES. Vol. IV. New York: Harpers. 1869.

Dr. Bellows is, without doubt, a genius of the New England Puritan style. To-day he is preaching eloquent semi-Arian discourses in Fourth Avenue; to-morrow organizing a Sanitary Commission in Washington; and next month

writing newspaper letters from the Nile or the Jordan. These letters, written in travel, were originally published in newspaper form, and are now put in their present shape for a more permanent perusal. It is a very clear and incisive book, as we might expect from so astute a man, and sparkles over with the author's idiosyncrasies on culture and religion. However we may differ from his conclusions — and this we always do when he touches a question of religion — no one can fail to discover a quick-sighted, hard-thinking, busy-minded man in its author. His travels take him in this volume from Venice and South Italy, by way of Egypt, to the Holy Land, and thence back through Turkey, to Italy and France again. He was thus brought face to face with some of the most solemn and magnificent civilizations of antiquity as well as certain religious movements like Mohammedanism and Judaism, which have lent their color to great or strange peoples. Dr. Bellows overlooks the historical landscape before him, and without, seemingly, the slightest doubt of his infallibility, gives a decision, whether it be about the age of a relic or the fate of a dynasty or race. There is nothing stupid about the book, and there have been few books of travel more thoughtfully written; and with this praise we might close this notice, were we not again reminded of the impossibility of a true Puritan — such as the Doctor is — comprehending more than the outside of what we call the Catholic Church, wherever he finds it. He sees her great power on men everywhere abased by the Latin heresy of the Pope; how she colors the very soul-life of the masses; but he blunders whenever he tries to analyze the (to him) mysterious elements of her greatness. The veil of Puritanism over his eyes blinds him to all that constitutes an historic Church. He tells us that Rome is strong, yet must grow weak; that she is aiming to rule this Continent; that Protestants are blind; that the next American war is likely to be a religious one; and yet his panacea is the nineteenth century progress! We want, Doctor, not quite so much of this nineteenth century as of the religion, system, and life of those Apostolic ages, wherein all worshipped in One Faith, as members of One Church, the One Godhead of the ever-blessed Three.

THE HISTORY OF CIVILIZATION. By AMOS DEAN, LL.D. In seven volumes. Vol. I. Albany, N. Y.: Joel Munsell. 1868.

If History be the story of God's teaching men by examples, the historian must be a man who at least believes in God. And further, any man who would write the History of Civilization, which is the story of mankind, must have a large heart, a Catholic culture, and be a Christian. It is possible for a pantheist or an atheist to accumulate the facts of a vast learning, and string them on some line of philosophy which suits his fancy; but to trace wisely the laws of human development, and to account for the singular, solemn, and ever-recurring destinies of races and nationalities, a man must believe in something more personal than blind Law, or the god of Pantheism. Hence it comes that so clever and omnivorous a student as Buckle, is forced to the lame conclusion that earthquakes make ports, and to argue the absurd proposition that if Protestant Englishmen had peopled South America, they would, thanks to the ease with which bananas grow, have been as lazy and as dirty as the South American Roman Catholic Spaniards. Religion, to the unwise, is foolishness; but the most foolish of all men are they who undertake to tell the story of our humanity, and yet ignore the Divine wisdom which shapes its

ends and denotes its limits. The historian, first of all, must be a reverent, a religious man. This, Amos Dean evidently was. Born in Vermont, of honest, God-fearing, New England stock, and battling for an education against fortune with a courage which wins our admiration, he rose steadily as a lawyer and a professor, in the city of his adoption, to a position of wide respect and trust. So much for the man.

It was the dream of his life to write a History of Civilization, and with a patient, energetic steadiness of aim, he read, thought, and wrote this present book, which is edited, we believe, by one of his children. When one considers the magnitude of the task, one wonders how a law lecturer in the city of Albany, could find even the time or books necessary to enable him to write so elaborate and valuable a history as this. For while Professor Dean was not strictly of that poetical temperament which waxes often eloquent or brilliant, there is a surprising amount of erudition and research in this volume, marshalled obediently as they are, by a practiced judicial mind and manner.

In the XVth chapter of this volume he discusses both the question of the origin and distribution of races, and tells us the story of the earliest historic nations, like the Chaldeans, the Assyrians, and the Egyptians. Of course in so hidden and ancient matters there is large room for differences of opinion, and men may not adopt all of Professor Dean's views as to the law of race, but it cannot be denied that he has given us a singularly minute and readable record of many dominant and richly-historied peoples. For instance, his account of Egyptian nationality, in its religion, politics, and social life, is one of the most readable and available discussions of the matter known to us. To criticise fairly this history, would require a history, and we close this notice of a book in many ways creditable to American authorship, by heartily commending it to the public and scholarly patronage of the country. The proof sheets of this book might have been more carefully read.

NOTICE.

The unusual length of Articles and number of Book Notices press from our pages our catalogue of magazines and papers, and also the list of consecrations and ordinations. This is regretted, as many smaller treatises, sermons, weeklies, monthlies, quarterlies, have more than ordinary interest, and display very great ability. And we are here reminded that the period is rapidly approaching in the history of the Review, when, from the mass of Books sent for notice, three or four will have to be selected for a more complete analysis; and thus, instead of a multitude of imperfect sketches, our readers will have a few short, but careful articles. The change is inevitable, and we hope will prove acceptable.